00031486

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society.

00031486

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 20 February, 2020

ESSAYS

ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE

REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

ESSAYS
ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH
THE REFORMATION
IN ENGLAND

By the late SAMUEL ROFFEY MAITLAND
D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., *sometime Librarian to Archbishop Howley and Keeper of the Manuscripts at Lambeth*

With an Introduction by
ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A.
Rector of Easthope, Salop

JOHN LANE
LONDON AND NEW YORK
1899

31486 ac

GOD
942
Mai/ESS
B14%G

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
London & Edinburgh

AUTHOR'S ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE READER

[1849]

THE first nineteen of these Essays were published in as many consecutive numbers of the "British Magazine," beginning with that of January, 1846.

The Twentieth Essay, and some other additions, making together nearly, if not quite, a third part of the volume, have not been before printed.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	ix–xix
ESSAY		
I.	PURITAN VERACITY, No. I. George Joye—Anthony Dalaber	1
II.	PURITAN VERACITY, No. II. Thomas Greene—John Careless	14
III.	PURITAN STYLE, No. I. John Bale, Bishop of Ossory	32
IV.	PURITAN STYLE, No. II. Bishop Ponet—Bartholomew Traheron . .	54
V.	PURITAN POLITICS, No. I. John Knox—Bishop Ponet—Wyat's Rebellion .	66
VI.	PURITAN POLITICS, No. II. The Duty of Subjects to their Rulers generally .	77
VII.	PURITAN POLITICS, No. III. Respecting Queen Mary in particular . . .	98
VIII.	PURITAN POLITICS, No. IV. The Spaniards	116
IX.	PURITAN POLITICS, No. V. The Change of Religion	136

ESSAY PAGE

X. THE PURITAN PALINODIA
The "Harborough" for faithful Subjects . . 150

XI. THE RIBALDS, No. I.
Thomas, Lord Cromwell 173

XII. THE RIBALDS, No. II.
Act of Six Articles 188

XIII. THE RIBALDS, No. III.
Act of Six Articles 204

XIV. THE RIBALDS, No. IV.
Act of Six Articles 223

XV. BISHOP GARDINER AND THE KING . . . 238

XVI. BISHOP GARDINER AND PAGET 250

XVII. BISHOP GARDINER AND BISHOP BONNER, No. I.
"De vera obedientia" 266

XVIII. BISHOP GARDINER AND BISHOP BONNER, No. II.
"De vera obedientia" 292

XIX. BISHOP GARDINER: HIS POPERY 308

XX. BISHOP BONNER'S CRUELTY 315
§ i. General Statements, and Fuller's in particular . . . . . *ib.*
§ ii. Some Occurrences during the first year and a half of Queen Mary's reign . 331
§ iii. The Commission in Southwark . . 341
§ iv. How far was Bonner concerned with the Martyrs condemned by it? . . 347
§ v. Bonner's dealings with his own prisoners 360
§ vi. His dealings with the Court . . . 380
§ vii. Those with his own prisoners resumed, with a List of all the Martyrs who suffered in the reign of Queen Mary . 384

INTRODUCTION

The time has not yet come, and it may yet be long in coming, when a final and authoritative history of the Reformation in England can be written. It is not from lack of published or otherwise easily accessible materials that this is so; certainly not from lack of interest taken in the subject. The difficulty arises rather from the fact that men with different religious convictions are so keenly interested. From at least three distinct points of view, the Roman, the Anglican, and the Puritan, almost everything that occurred in this country during the years 1531–1560*—which may be regarded concisely as our Reformation period—has quite a different look; and while these different aspects of the same events are insisted upon with some learning and much shrewdness, combined with great earnestness and sincerity, the mere historian, who is not interested in any special religious point of view, but is anxious only that the facts should be fully and accurately stated, has little chance of a hearing. It is true that during the last sixty years the one-sided and ill-informed estimate that for over two centuries almost exclusively prevailed, has been persistently criticised and has been largely abandoned; but meanwhile, as an outcome of the Oxford movement, a new but equally unhistorical estimate has been gaining acceptance; an estimate that, in the interests of the "continuity" of the Church of England, makes light of the great issues that were really fought out and determined in the middle of the sixteenth century, and promulgates a doctrine which amounts to something like this,—that the Church of England was Protestant before the Reformation, and Catholic afterwards. No doubt a true and vital continuity can be traced throughout the*

period; but to ignore the far-reaching character of the changes that were actually effected is little short of an insult to the common sense of every man who knows the history of his country.

The growth of this new misconception, however, need not hinder a welcome being given to this reprint of a work which, fifty years ago, did so much to discredit the old one. So thoroughly, in fact, did Maitland do his work, that he may almost be held responsible for that new view of the Reformation which, overstated now to the point of grotesqueness, he would certainly have shown up unsparingly had he been writing in 1899 *instead of in* 1849. *For he was before all things a born historical critic, indefatigable in his recourse to original documents, determined to let them speak for themselves, and anxious only that the truth should prevail. Mr. Frederick Stokes, in his Introduction to a new edition* (1889) *of our author's earlier and no less valuable volume on the "Dark Ages," truly says of him that "he was one of those in whom the critical faculty existed in its highest perfection; and his ecclesiastical position enabled him to deal impartially with both sides of his subject." A brief notice of his career may enable some readers the better to appreciate his work.*

The child of Nonconformist parents, and mainly self-educated, Samuel Roffey Maitland kept terms at St. John's and at Trinity, Cambridge, but was disqualified from graduating by his religious position. His University career was, however, fruitful in friendships which greatly influenced his career, W. H. Mill being one of those whose confidence he thenceforward enjoyed through life. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple; and, though he soon abandoned the attempt to win a practice, his legal studies left a mark on his character, and guided and developed his instinctive love of sifting truth from error. Ordained in the Church of England in 1821, *he first interested himself in the conversion of the Jews, especially on the Continent, and he travelled abroad to study the difficulties of the problem. Devoting himself at the same time to an examination of certain periods of Church History, he published in* 1832 *a monograph on the Albigenses and Waldenses, an elaborate work which secured a general recognition of his ability and critical insight. In* 1835 *he began to contribute to the* British Magazine, *then edited by Hugh James Rose, the notable series of Essays afterwards reprinted as the*

two volumes "The Dark Ages" and "The Reformation." In 1838 *Archbishop Howley made him Librarian at Lambeth, and conferred on him the honorary degree of D.D.; and the year following, when he succeeded Rose (Newman's friend) as editor of the* British Magazine, *he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society; but he never received any benefice or other recognition of his labours and his ability. He retired from the editorship in* 1849, *the year in which the volume now reprinted was published; and, apart from a small volume of Essays which appeared in* 1852, *little else came from his pen. He died in* 1866.

In 1850 *he had published "A Plea for a Church-History Society"; and his proposals show so much business-like common sense, united with a keen appreciation of the need for patient study of original documents, if the outcome is to have serious value, that we may well regret he was never placed in a position in which he could carry out his scheme. But the work he had done had left him too little a* persona grata *with the dominant parties in the Church to permit any but a very powerful patron to give him a berth, such as that of a Dean, in which he would have found full independence for literary work. He had shattered the idols of the Evangelicals, and he was also "an object of suspicion to the Tractarians, whom he declined to follow in their later developments." In* 1841 *he had denounced Keble's tract, "On the Mysticism attributed to the early Fathers of the Church," with a fierceness that betrayed some lack of appreciation of the poetic aspect of Scripture. Had Dr. Maitland lived fifty years longer he would probably have viewed the matter differently, and would have admitted that, where the literal and historical interpretation (which he assumed as certain) is impossible, the allegorical and poetical interpretation is not only allowable but necessary. But although he was a man of many talents—he was brilliant in conversation, a skilled musician, and a draughtsman in black and white with so delicate a touch that his pen-and-ink drawings were often mistaken for engravings—he seems to have been too matter-of-fact in his literary criticism to be able to appreciate spiritual fancies that Keble could view with sympathy. More to his taste was it to show up popular but ill-founded traditions, and to insist that something more vertebrate than a pious sentiment should stand behind men's conceptions of the religious changes in the sixteenth century.*

This is the rightful temper of an historical critic; and it is satisfactory to learn that his influence, both direct and indirect, on historical studies at Cambridge has been very great. In the "Dictionary of National Biography" it is well said of him that, "animated by a rare desire after simple truth, generously candid and free from all pretence or pedantry, he wrote in a style which was peculiarly sparkling, lucid, and attractive," and that "few men of his generation were more stimulating and suggestive."

That the volume now offered to the public is a reprint, and not a new and revised edition, is a matter that hardly requires explanation. Since 1849, *when the book was published, so much fresh light has been thrown on the Reformation period by the publication of State Papers and other historical manuscripts, and by the labours of Brewer, Dixon, Gairdner, Gasquet, Pocock, and others, that there would literally be no end to the new matter that it might seem desirable to add by way of notes, not to speak of the temptation an editor would be under to give at length his reasons for differing from his author on points where he would almost necessarily differ. The work is therefore given here precisely as Maitland published it, apart from the correction of a few obvious misprints. But the question may then very pertinently be asked, Why reprint at all a work that is confessedly in some respects old-fashioned and obsolete? The answer, I think, is that, whatever faults the book may have, it was nevertheless an epoch-making work, and must always remain a book that needs to be read. Possibly it may be rating it too highly to say of it as absolutely as it was said of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," that you must read it to understand the period, whatever else you may read. But it is certainly a book that no student of the Reformation can afford to be without. It is an indispensable introduction, even though it may need correction from subsequent investigations. The new light that has been thrown on the period during the last fifty years has very largely confirmed the view that Maitland indicated; certainly it has made it impossible for men to be content with the older tradition which he discredited.*

But there is another side to all this; and I trust I shall not be accused of unduly disparaging Maitland's work if I proceed to point out how he must also be read with caution. An example or two will suffice to illustrate the criticisms that

I think should be made. In the Fourth Essay, entitled "Puritan Style, No. II." (pp. 54–66) he sets to work to prove, by extracts from Traheron and others, that the Reformers were foul-mouthed; and so no doubt they were. It may have been worth while to establish this fact fifty years ago, when a false tradition as to the moral superiority of Protestants over Catholics, at the date of the Reformation, prevailed; but it would be easy to cap every quotation given by Maitland with one in equally bad taste from a contemporary Catholic writer. For, indeed, the strong language, which he rightly holds up to reprobation, is characteristic of the time, and not of any particular religious party. Mr. Law has shown us how, in the reign of Elizabeth, Jesuits and seculars indulged in similarly odious recriminations. If therefore any one should rise from the perusal of these Essays with the impression that the Reformers were in this respect a depraved body of controversialists, it would be an unfortunate result of that one-sided exposition of the history of the period which our author fifty years ago thought it necessary to present. In truth, the sixteenth century was an unlovely era; and it may be questioned whether any of its personages demand our unstinted admiration, save the great and glorious Sir Thomas More.

Again, Maitland must not be followed slavishly in his estimate of the political aspect of the Reformation. He is shocked by the disloyalty of such protests as that against the "monstrous regiment of women," made in the reign of Mary; and he makes merry over the shifts to which the maintainers of such a protest were driven when the accession of Elizabeth put the novel notion of a queen-regnant in a wholly different light. His tenth Essay, entitled "The Puritan Palinodia," deals with this subject. That there was plenty of moral cowardice among the advocates of reform may be true enough; the flight of so many over the seas may be accepted as sufficient proof of this. But is it fair to hold up to ridicule—and I must say, though it is only a small detail, that his pedantic adherence to the obsolete spelling of these quaint Protestants seems designed to make their protests look the more ludicrous—men who were fighting with their lives in their hands against tremendous odds, and were fighting in great measure for dimly discerned principles of political if not yet of religious liberty, which have since been accepted as just and necessary by nearly all the civilised nations of the world? I think that

Maitland, in his intelligible contempt for the then dominant unhistorical estimate of the Reformation as a religious movement, was somewhat blind to its significance as an era in which the seeds of a most necessary political revolution were sown. This aspect of it has in later years been admirably sketched by Mr. F. Seebohm, in his "Era of the Protestant Revolution," published in 1874.

Further, Dr. Maitland's keen critical instinct sometimes led him into an excessive historical scepticism. Bishop Bonner's reputation for fiendish cruelty he did indeed definitely expose as a wholly unjust estimate. But when he was dealing with Bonner's Preface to the second edition of Gardiner's treatise "De Vera Obedientia," he allowed his sense of the unlikeliness of Bonner's having written such a Preface to get the better of his recognition of the soundness of the historical evidence on which the fact rests. He discusses the matter with much fulness and fairness in his seventeenth and eighteenth Essays; but I do not think that the conclusion he suggests, that the Preface was a forgery, has been accepted by any historian qualified to pronounce a judgment in the case. No doubt it is difficult to understand how a Catholic Bishop like Bonner, who had spent some time in Rome, and had had personal relations with the Pope, should, under pressure, of which there is nothing recorded to show that it was specially severe, have backed up Gardiner's repudiation of the Pope's authority over the Church in England, and have amplified it by a good deal of coarse abuse (*see pp.* 302, 303); *but many things in the sixteenth century are difficult to understand; while the positive evidence for this having come from Bonner's pen is not seriously shaken by the criticisms, painstaking and ingenious as these are, which Maitland adduces.*

So too as to his attacks on Foxe, the martyrologist. On this point I am permitted to use a communication from Mr. A. F. Pollard, author of numerous articles in the "Dictionary of National Biography" that are concerned with the Reformation period, of which he has made a close and careful study:

"*I think Maitland's attack on the veracity of Foxe is overdone. No doubt Foxe made mistakes and was unduly credulous; but I don't think he was any worse than Sanders, for instance. In one or two cases which I have examined I have found indications in State Papers and elsewhere pointing to at least a substratum of fact in Foxe's stories which Mait-*

land denounces as ridiculous; and Mr. James Gairdner has declared that 'there is no reason to doubt the essential truth' of the story of the intrigue against Catherine Parr, about which Maitland is particularly contemptuous."

So much then may be said by way of criticism and caution in regard to the work now reprinted; while its many and great merits, as an opening-up of an ever-interesting period, will not escape the notice of any attentive reader. Maitland certainly succeeds in making the Reformation live before our eyes.

I shall perhaps be presuming on the indulgence of the readers of this Introduction if I venture on any suggestions of my own as to how the history of this period may most profitably be studied; but it occurs to me to say that, while the tendency is just now to minimise the significance of what occurred between the years 1531 and 1560, and to include the succeeding hundred years as a part of the Reformation period, so that the Church of England may get the benefit of the reaction which stamped a somewhat different character on the Prayer-book as revised in 1662, the truer method would be to concentrate attention on the short period that elapsed between the death of Henry VIII. and the death of Somerset the Protector, as being that during which the great and decisive changes were consummated. Notice must, of course, be taken of Henry's breach with Rome so as to secure his marriage with Anne Boleyn, for without this the Reformation that was accomplished would not have been accomplished; and notice must also be taken of the settlement under Elizabeth, as the definite establishment of England as a Protestant State. But the Catholic reaction under Mary was apparently so superficial (as it was certainly transient), that the Elizabethan settlement may fairly be regarded as based on the earlier settlement in 1552, from which the Marian incident did not really divide it; and thus the supreme importance of the period 1547–52 is indicated as that in which the English Reformation was effected. A fully detailed account of these momentous years is still a desideratum, as is also a full biography of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, the best summary of whose career is at present to be found in the "Dictionary of National Biography." We very naturally shrink from ascribing the religious emancipation of England to either Henry, or Edward, or Elizabeth; but there need be no such feeling of shame in ascribing it to Somerset,

who was not only a great statesman and ruler, but also a man of high moral character and of deep religious convictions. It is true that he appropriated to himself a large share of the confiscated monastic property; but this must be interpreted in accordance with the circumstances of the day, which had made that confiscation necessary, and warranted the assignment of a very considerable estate to the real ruler of the kingdom, whose position was so nearly regal that he styled the King of France his "brother." An estate that may be reckoned at £100,000 a year in modern value is hardly extravagant for a man in such a position; and Somerset is the less open to the charge of avarice, since he had princely ideas as to the spending of his income in grand buildings, &c.

However that may be, it is certainly to him that we owe the establishment of a religious Reformation in England, as we also owe to him the special character that it took. Under his presidency the men of the New Learning produced, first a form for administering the Communion, to be used in connection with the Mass; and the Proclamation prefixed to this (understood to have been written by the Protector himself), a document devout and judicious in its tone, indicated further changes to come; a promise fulfilled by the publication the year following of the semi-Catholic Prayer-Book of 1549. *For the Protestant liturgy of* 1552, *which, with slight modifications, has remained the Prayer-book of the Reformed Church of England ever since, he was not directly responsible; and, although it is quite possible that, had he remained in power, he would have approved and have enforced this rapid progress in a Puritan direction, he would certainly have gone to work more cautiously, and would not have identified religious reforms, as Northumberland did, with that political violence and tyranny which paved the way for the Marian reaction. But, setting this aside as merely conjectural, it is clear that by the action of Somerset and his associates the mediæval religious system was gradually and steadily laid aside, and a return was made to what was thought to be a primitive if not an apostolic form of worship.*

But the changes that were actually made were of less importance than were the principles by the acceptance of which it became possible to make them. Never formally stated, they amount to something like this, that venerable

articles of religious faith, no less than traditional religious observances and ritual, are reformable in accordance with the temper and the learning of the times. This was practically a repudiation of the Church's infallible magisterium; *and, although we know that at a later date Elizabeth insisted on a formal assertion of the Church having "authority in matters of faith," it has never been possible in the Church of England to treat this as more than a provisional authority, in the interests of order and discipline. Consistently with the principles on which it was reformed in the middle of the sixteenth century, our Church is still, and must always remain, a learner as well as a teacher. And the Articles of Religion, that in due time were formulated, showed clearly to those who read them intelligently how wide was the door that had been opened; although those who opened it did not venture far themselves, but were rather for insisting on new fences to restrict the liberty of those whom the Reformation should have emancipated. The Creeds were to be "received and believed," not on the authority of the Church, but because they could be "proved" by Scripture; and on the cogency of that proof they were to depend. But Scripture itself, the supreme authority, was subjected to the test of scholarship. True, in the Sixth Article, the phrases run "never any doubt in the Church" and "commonly received"; but, when we inquire into the reason for which the apocryphal books were relegated to an inferior position, we find that it was due to literary criticism, a result of the New Learning. So long as these books had been, in unscholarly fashion, accepted as a part of the Bible in the Vulgate version, there was "never any doubt" as to their authenticity; but, so soon as it became a question of sources and of original documents, the discovery (in some cases, as we now know, erroneous) that the so-called apocryphal books were written in Greek and not in Hebrew was regarded as a sufficient reason for deposing them from the position they had held for centuries as of equal authority with the other books of the Old Testament. It is not necessary to point out how this principle of the subjection of Scripture to scholarship, established though not stated at the Reformation, is applicable in our own day. And a Church that was free to learn in the sixteenth century is also free to learn in the nineteenth or any subsequent century.*

With the now much-vexed question of the "continuity" of

the Church of England, Maitland does not directly deal; but the upshot of his disquisitions would rather tend towards the recognition of the Anglo-Roman body as the legitimate representative of the old Catholic Church of England. And this would be indisputable if practical identity in doctrine and discipline were the sole criterion. But there was, and has remained until now, a continuity, both spiritual and material, between that ancient Church and the Anglican Church of to-day, which cannot be lightly set aside. Even during the reign of Elizabeth, while doctrinal differences of a far-reaching kind were admitted, or rather were insisted on, this continuity was emphatically claimed. The claim was based then on the actual possession of the dignities, buildings, and endowments of the older Church, which was of course undeniable; it is based by some now on the assertion of a continuous hieratic ministry; an assertion that the Pope has recently condemned. But it is safer to find spiritual continuity in the paramount importance of a living faith in Christ, which was and is the possession of both Catholics and Protestants, however much, in matters of less moment, they may have differed; and herein lies the true and vital connection between the two.

In a letter addressed to me in 1888, *Mr. Gladstone, whom I had asked in what sense he understood the existence of a spiritual continuity between the ancient Catholic Church and the existing Church of England, replied, "In the Elizabethan interval, and before Anglicanism had a recognised existence as a form of thought, I should look for the spiritual continuity in men like Bernard Gilpin, as, before the Reformation, mainly in men like Colet." Although this hardly involves "continuity" in the sense in which the question was asked, the conjunction of these two names strikes me as particularly happy: for, while both of them were Catholic priests by ordination, neither of them could be described as Roman in their sympathies; indeed, it would be truer to say of both that their tone of mind, as ecclesiastics and as educationists, was more what would now be reckoned as Anglican. And the name of Bernard Gilpin suggests the lines on which a true, popular history of the Reformation might be written. Born in* 1517 *and dying in* 1583, *ordained in the reign of Henry VIII., selected to preach before Edward VI., presented to an important benefice in the north of England in the reign of Mary, and holding it until his death, he might seem an obvious butt for*

satire on the laxity of conscience in those who conformed throughout the Reformation period. But a study of his life would tell a very different tale, and show a man of deep Christian convictions and unimpeachable honesty, deservedly held in honour, not only by the conforming priests of whom he was one, and who formed of course the great majority of the clergy of the Church of England during the early years of Elizabeth's reign, but also by the new men, ordained under the new régime. *An historical romance, based on the life of Bernard Gilpin, concerning whom a good deal is known, and illustrated, by a competent historical scholar, with accurately stated incidents, in which the religious life of the Reformation period should be depicted, as graphically as Newman in "Callista," or Pater in "Marius the Epicurean," depicted the growth of Christian ideas in the early centuries of our era—such a book would certainly go far to fill the vacant place to which at the outset I referred; and might, in the guise of fiction, obtain a wide circulation and popular acceptance, doing thus a great service to the cause of historical truth. It is a grave matter that some thousands of religious teachers throughout the country, men whose position demands that their utterances should be treated with respect by those to whom they speak, should, in the interests of a quite modern conception of what the Church of England really is, be now insisting on a minimising account of what happened at the Reformation, such as no historian would accept as even nearly accurate. And the gravity lies, not in the mere holding of a mistaken estimate, but in the proceedings that are based thereupon. Should this reprint of Maitland's famous work stimulate a taste for historical research, for a study of the actual words of the promoters of the Reformation, and of the other illustrative documents of the period, it will also serve to discredit a current misconception that it was impossible for him to foresee.*

ERRATUM.

Page 67, line 11, *for* "1544" *read* "1554."

ESSAYS.

ESSAY I.

PURITAN VERACITY. No. I.

GEORGE JOYE—ANDREW DALABER.

For the history of the Reformation in England, we depend so much on the testimony of writers, who may be considered as belonging, or more or less attached, to the puritan party,—or who obtained their information from persons of that sect,—that it is of the utmost importance to inquire whether there was any thing in their notions respecting *truth*, which ought to throw suspicion on any of their statements.

The question is one which does not require much research or argument. There is something very frank (one is almost inclined to say, honest) in the avowals, either direct or indirect, which various puritans have left on record, that it was considered not only allowable, but meritorious, to tell lies for the sake of the good cause in which they were engaged, and for the benefit of those who were fellow-helpers in it. The case is not merely that the charitable partizan looked with compassion on the weak brother who denied his faith under the dread of cruel torments, or stood by with pitying and loving connivance while he told a lie as to some matter of fact, to save his own life, or lives dearer than his own. It is, that they did not hesitate, without any such urgent temptation, and with great deliberation and solemnity, to state what they knew to be false; and that the manner in which such falsehoods were

avowed by those who told them, and recorded by their friends and admirers, is sufficient evidence that such a practice was not considered discreditable. This will be best proved and illustrated by a few facts, which require no further general introduction than what has been already given; and it is hoped that the reader will understand, that in thus bringing them forward the object is, not to criminate any person or class of persons; but to inquire how far we may rely on statements resting on the authority of those who adopted puritan principles.

"When the Party," says Bishop Burnet, "became so considerable, that it was known there were societies of them, not only in London, but in both the universities, then the Cardinal [Wolsey] was constrained to act. His contempt of the clergy was looked on as that which gave encouragement to the heretics. When reports were brought to court of a company that were in Cambridge, Bilney, Latimer, and others that read and propagated Luther's book and opinions, some Bishops moved, in the year 1523, that there might be a visitation appointed to go to Cambridge, for trying who were the fautors of heresy there. But he, as Legate, did inhibit it (upon what grounds I cannot imagine), which was brought against him afterwards in Parliament, (Art. 43. of his impeachment.) Yet, when these doctrines were spread everywhere, he called a meeting of all the Bishops and divines, and canonists about London; where Thomas Bilney and Thomas Arthur were brought before them, and articles were brought in against them. The whole process is set down at length by Fox in all points according to Tonstall's register, except one fault in the translation. When the Cardinal asked Bilney whether he had not taken an oath before, not to preach, or defend any of Luther's doctrines, he confessed he had done it, but not *judicially*, (*judicialiter* in the register.) This Fox translates, *not lawfully*. In all other particulars there is an exact agreement between the Register and his Acts."—*Hist. Ref.*, vol. i. p. 31.

Fox, who, as Burnet says, has set down the whole process at length, begins by telling us that, on the 27th of November, 1527, "Cardinal Wolsey with his complices," that is to say, "a great number of Bishops, as the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cuthbert [Tonstal] of London, John [Fisher] of Rochester, Nicholas [West] of Ely, John [Voysey] of Exeter, John [Longlond] of Lincoln, John [Clerk] of Bath and Wells, Harry [Standish] of St. Asaph, with many others, both divines and lawyers, came into the chapter-house at Westminster," to examine Thomas Bilney and Thomas Arthur as to their having "preached or taught to the people the opinions of Luther or any others con-

demned by the church." With the details of this process, however, we have no business at present; and perhaps the story is so well known, that it is almost unnecessary to say that, according to Fox, "Bilney was a Cambridge man, and the first framer of that university in the knowledge of Christ[1]; " and that he converted many of his fellows to the knowledge of the gospel, amongst which number were Thomas Arthur, and Master Hugh Latimer; and at length "forsaking the university, went into many places teaching 'and preaching, being associate with Arthur, which accom-'panied him from the university."

Thus it was that Arthur and Bilney came to be called before the cardinal "and his complices;" but I do not want to say more about them at present; and, indeed, I only mention the august tribunal before which they were summoned, in order to introduce a person who was *not* there, though he had received a very particular invitation to attend, and had, to a certain extent, accepted it. This person was George Joye, who was then a fellow of Peter House, in Cambridge, and who is now not quite unknown, from his connexion with Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, and from several works which he published, especially an attack on Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, which elicited a reply, entitled, "A Declaration of such true articles as George Ioye hath gon about to confute as false[2]."

Fox does not appear to have known that Joye was cited with Bilney and Arthur; and I refer to the account of that process, in his Martyrology, only that the reader may better comprehend what here follows, and perceive that I am not selecting, for an illustration, the story of a person inconsiderable or unknown. George Joye was well known, and a man of some consequence, among those who followed the new learning.

The facts which led to his being summoned with Bilney and Arthur seem to have been these. The Prior of Newnham Abbey, near Bedford, told the suffragan of the Bishop

[1] Edit. 1596, p. 910.

[2] I suppose that most of what is known of him is collected in Lewis's History of the Translations of the Bible, p. 79, et seq. On the ground that one of his works is professedly "Printed at London by George Joye," Herbert gives him a place in his edition of Ames's Typographical Antiquities, vol. i. p. 567.

of Lincoln, that George Joye held some heretical opinions. The suffragan told the bishop; and the bishop wrote direct to the prior for further information. The prior replied fully to the bishop, and the consequence was, that Joye was cited to attend at that meeting in the Chapter House, at which, as we have seen, John, Bishop of Lincoln, was one of the "complices" of his friend and patron the cardinal. What Joye did on that occasion he shall tell in his own words, as soon as I have explained how we come to have the prior's letter to the bishop, and given some account of its contents.

It seems that, by some means or other, that letter came into the hands of Joye; and when he considered himself safe from his pursuers, he printed it, with a commentary replying to the charges which it contained. His little book is entitled "The Letters whyche Johan Ashwell, Priour of 'Newnham Abbey besydes Bedforde, sente secretly to the 'Byshope of Lyncolne, in the yeare of our Lord M.D.xxvii. 'where in the sayde Pryour accuseth George Joye that tyme 'beyng felowe of Peter College in Cambrydge, of fower 'opinyons: with the answere of the sayde George vnto the 'same opynyons[3]." It consists of about fifty-eight small pages, and is dated at the end, "¶ At Straszburge, the 10. daye of June;" and beneath is added, "¶ This lytell boke be delyuerd to Johan Ashwel Prior of Newnhā Abbey besydes Bedforde with spede." On the back of the title, George Joye gives a brief synopsis of the errors and heresies with which he was charged, in the following form:

"¶ The fyrste opinion is (as M. priour sayth) that a symple preyst hath as large and as greate power to bynde and to lose, as hath a byshope, or the byshope of Rome.

¶ The seconde that he imputeth vnto me is that fayth is sufficient wythout workes.

¶ The thyrde that he fayneth on me, is that euery preist may have a wyfe or a concubine.

¶ The fowerth, that euery laye man maye heare confessions.

[3] It may be proper to say, with respect to books of this period, that while I endeavour to give all extracts as correctly as possible, I do not feel bound to copy exactly the punctuation, (where there is anything that can be properly so called,) or all the contractions, misprints, and obsolete spelling which would render them tiresome, if not unintelligible to most readers. For words in brackets, unless otherwise explained, I am responsible.

¶ v. And because he sayth that I had men going on pylgrimage in deriseon, I have set to the scripture that dampneth worshippyng of images."

The next page begins:

"¶ Here foloweth the Pryours letters taken out of hys own hande worde for worde.

¶ The Superscription.
To our moste Reverend father in Christ and speciall good lorde my lorde of Lyncolne our diocesan be thys deliuered wyth spede.

Most Reuerende father in god, dew recommendations had to you with humble obedience: I, your spirituall chylde, louing subget, and daily bedaman, is gladde to here of your prosperous welfare, y^e^ which I and my brethern dayly praye to god to continew. And where as your lordship wrote your louynge letters, wyllynge them to be kepte secrete: so I beseche your lordshyp, that these symple letters of myne may be kepte secrete vnto your selfe. Also, where as my Lorde your suffragane informed your lordship one master Joye, by y^e^ knowledge that he had of me, what erroneus opynyons he hylde: forsothe some be oute of my mynde, and some I haue called to my mynde by the reason of your letters. Una opinio erat, &c."

Here the cautious prior proceeds to detail the errors and heresies in Latin, but as we have already had a synopsis of them, we may skip rather more than a page, and take him up when he again becomes English.

"But for these and diuerse other we haue bene sumtyme sine charitate propter circumstantes and sedentes. And sumtime I haue geuen him exhortation openly, and sumtyme secretely, that he shuld leue such Lutronus opinions. Also M. Chaunceler made serche for him diuerse times when he came into the contre; but thē he was euer at Cambrig in Peter house. And M. Chaunceler gaue vnto me strait commaundement in your lordshipes name that I shuld not suffer him to preche in none of your churches without your licens and writing with your sealle; and so he came no more at me; nor I praye to god that he do not, except he amende, quia dictum vulgare infectionis with heresi, iulisy, and frensy, &c., but I beseche your lordship that no creature maye know that I, or any of mine, do shew you of these thinges for then I shall leusse the fauor of many in my contre. But I am, & haue ben, & wyll be euer at your commaundement. Et sic valeatis in Christo Jesu sicut cor in corpore meo.

Your louing subget and dayly orator Johannes
Prior de Newenham licet indignus.

¶ More ouer I haue harde sume reporte that when he haue ben among lay persons at festis or yonkeres in the contre he hath had

many lewde opinions among the people & some good folkys would murmur and grugge at his saynges and some wold reioyse therein."

Having thus given the prior's letters, (or as we should now say, letter,) George Joye proceeds to confute his charges point by point; but this is not to our purpose; we are not discussing the Lutheran opinions charged on him, but inquiring how far he was a credible witness as to matters of fact; and the part which concerns us is a sort of postscript, which he entitles—

"¶ The storie of my state after the bishop had receyued the pryours letters"

and which begins thus:—

"On the Saterdaye seuennyght before aduent sondaye, the yeare of our Lorde M.D.XXVII. there were letters sent as from the Cardinall by one of hys offycers to Cambrydge, delyuered to the vyce Canceller called Doctour Edmonds master of Peter college, where I was then felowe. In whyche letters he was commaunded to sende me up to appeare at Westminster ye wendesdaye folowyng [the 27th of November] at ix. of the clok with Bylney and Arture, for certayne erroneous opynyons, &c. Our master sent for me on the morow in to the contrey, and I came to hym, on the mondaye. He shewed me the letters; I red them, and sawe the Cardinals sygne manuell subscrybed in great letters, and his seale. I gote me horse when it snewed, and was colde, and came to London, and so to Westmynster, not longe after my howre, when Bilney and Arture were in examinacyon. Whyche thynge when I harde of, and knewe but those two poore shepe among so many cruel wolues, I was not ouer hastye to thruste in amonge them; for there was a shrewd mayney of bishops beside the Cardinal with other of theyr faction. And I thought to heare how these two lytell lambes shulde spede, yere I wold put myselfe into these lyons mouthes. I went to my diner and taried walkyng in the cyte.

"At last, on the Saterday, I came to a Master of myne called Syr Wyllyam Gascoingue, the Cardinales tresurer: and shewed him my errende, but he knewe all the conuayaunce of my cause better than I (for I beleue yet he was the author of all my trouble) and he bad me go in to the chamber of presence, and there Doctour Capon should present me to the Cardinall. I was but a course courtyer, neuer before hearynge this terme 'chamber of presence,' ne knew where it was; and I was halfe ashamed to aske after it; and went into a longe entrye on the lefte hande; and at laste happened vpon a dore, and knocked, and one opened it; and when I loked in, it was the kichen. Then I went backe into the hall, and asked for the chamber of presence; and one poynted me up a payer of stayers. There stode I in the chamber of presence, when I wold wyth all my harte haue ben absent, waytynge for Doctour Capon almost an

hower; for I was not ouer hasty to aske after hym. There no man knew me, nor I them. There was a great fyer in the chamber, the wether was colde, and I saw now and then a Bishop come out; but I durste not stand nyghe the fyer, for feare of burnyng. Theyr was in all aboute a dozen bishops, whose solemne and lordely lokys pleased me not. Whom when I behelde, betwene me and the fyer, as they passed forbye, in good faythe me though[t] I saw nothing els but the galouse and the hangman: but, as grace was, none of them knew me. Then the tresurer sent for me downe into his chamber; and there he told me, that the Cardynal sente not for me. Then I beganne to smell theyr secrete conuayaunce, and how they had counterfeted theyr lordes, the Cardinales, letters. And here the tresurer sent me to the bishope of Lyncolne, tellynge me that a suffragane had accused me. Whych suffragane I neuer see nor knew. I went a good pase toward the bishops place, and ouertoke hys chaunceler, called Doctour Rains, shewing him y^t^ I wold speake wyth my lord. He shewed my lord of me, and said that I must come againe the mornyng at .vi. of the clocke. I dyd so, and wayted for my lorde at the stayers fote til it was about .viii. My lord came down, and I dyd my dutye to hym. He asked me, 'Be you M. Joye?' 'Ye forsothe my lorde,' quod I. 'Abyde,' said he, 'wyth my Chaunceler tyll I come agayne;' (for my lord with all the bishopes toke theyr barges to wayte upon the Cardinall that mornyng to Grenewiche to the kyng,) I desired my lord to be good lord unto me, and shew me his pleasure, what hys lordshype wold with me, and wherfore I am thus sent unto hym; and he answered me like a lord, and bad me tary with his chaunceler, and sayd I shuld wayte vpon his laiser. There toke I my leue of my lord, and saw him no more.

"¶ Then, bycause M. Gascoigne rode home the same day into Bedfordeshier, and bad me ouer euen to come againe on the morow and tell him how I sped, I desyerde M. Chaunceler to [let me] go to him, promisyng to come agayne at such a time as he wold apointe me at my lordes coming home; for he tolde me that my lorde wold come agayne the same day about .ii. or .iii. of the cloke. I came to M. Gascoing, whych I perceyued by his wordes fauored me not, and he rebuked me because I studied Arigene, [Origen] 'Whych was an heretike,' said he; and he said that I helde such opinions as did Bilney and Arture: which discomforted me very sore, when I perceyued him to be my enemye, whom I toke for my good master. There I saw hym laste. Then came I to the byshopes place agayne at my houre, and shewed my selfe to M. Chaunceler. And there daunsed I a colde attendance tyll all most nyght; and yet my lord was not come. Then I went to M. Chaunceler wyth whom was Watson the scribe, desyryng him that I mought departe; for I though[t] my lord wold not come home that nyght, sayng that I had farre to my lodging, and I loued not to walke late. Lothe they were, I perceyued, and especially the scribe, that I shulde go: but they wolde nether byd me to supper, nor promyse me lodgynge; and I made haste, sayng that I wold come agayne on the morow to se and my lord were come home. Then sayd the scribe, 'Where is your lodging?' And here *I was so bold to make the scribe a lye* for hys asking; telling hym that I laye at the grene drogon toward

Bishopsgate, when I laye a myle of, euen a contrary waye; for *I neuer trusted scribes nor pharisais*, and I perceyued he asked me not for any good. Here I bad them bothe good nyght.

"As I went now I thought thus with my selfe, I am a scholer of Cambridge under only the vice chauncelers iurisdiction, and under the great God the Cardinal; and M. Gascoigne said the Cardinall sent not for me; I wyll take a brethe yere I come to these men agayne. On the morowe I was not ouer hastie to come to the chaunceler; but as I walked in the citie, I met with a scoler of Cambrydge; and he tolde me that the bisshop of Lincolne had sent hys seruaunt besely to enquire, and to seke me; 'What is the matter' quod I. 'Mary,' quod he, 'it is sayde that he wold geue you a benefice for preachyng in hys diocese.' '*A benefice*,' quod I, 'ye a *malefice* rather, for so rewarde they men for wel doynge.' Then I gote me horse and rode fro my benefice, and lefte college, and all that I had, and conuayed me selfe towarde the seaside ready to flee farther yf need were. But many a foule, jeoperdouse, and sorowfull, iourny had I yere I came there. And, in my traueling, I mette with a good felowe of mi olde acquaintaunce, which merueled gretly to see me in so straunge a countrye, to whome I opened my minde shewyng him partely of my hateful state, troublouse and paynfull iournes that I had both by vnknowne waies, and also be night many times. 'Be my trowthe,' quod he, 'I meruel ye be not robbed so many theueshe wayes as you have ryden.' And then he warned me of a theueshe place that I must nedes ride bye, and [I] asked him agayne, 'Know you the place, and what great men dwel theraboutes?' 'Ye well,' sayd he. Then quod I, 'But dwel ther any bishopes that waye?' (for I had leuer have mette with .xx. theues then wyth one bishope.) 'Nay,' quod he. Then was I glad, and rode on my waye, and euer blessed me from byshopes.

"But the bishop of Lincolne layed prevey wait for me to be taken, and my fete bound under an horse bely to brought in him. The be as the great bishop of Ely our visitour, angry *supra modum*[4]; and yet he wolde haue cyted me *viis et modis*, expulsed me my college when I was gone, had my flyght preuented his comyng. *Sed benedictus dominus qui non dedit me in captione dentibus eorum.* [Ps. cxxiv. 6.] Amen.

"¶ Nowe M. priour, if there be any thyng in thys my answere that offendeth you, blame your selfe, not me. You firste rolled the stone; I am not yet (thanked be God) so feabled, but that by Gods helpe, I am able to rolle it you agayne; not to hurte you, as you hurted me; but rather to heale your ignoraunce wyth the trewe knowleg of goddes word. And where as I am not so pacient in my answere as I ought to be, and as you desyre, I praye you impute it vnto the commune decease of all men borne of Adam whose childe I am, yet staned with those carnal affectes souked out of him fro my conception and can not be fully mortified but by death, then to be perfite, renued in spirit, and made lyke oure brother Chryste, the fyrste begoter among hys many brotheren. But yet of thys one present conforte we are here al sure that beleue in goddes promise;

[4] The text appears to be corrupt. I give it as it stands.

that is to say, al our infirmities and synne (of the whych as longe as we are in this mortal fleshe we can not be perfitly deliuerd) to be swelowed in christes deth thorow our faith, nether shall they be imputed vnto us, Christ being our ryghtuousnes, wysdome, holines, our redemption, and our satisfaction before his father," &c.

The reader will bear in mind that we are not discussing the question, whether George Joye had a right to deceive his persecutors; or, indeed, how far what he did was morally right or wrong. That is, no doubt, a very important question; but it is not the one now under consideration. We are at present only inquiring how far he, or any member of the sect of which he was a leader, may be relied on as an authority in matters relating to that sect. He tells us, without any appearance of hesitation or compunction, that he said what was false to others. May he not be doing the same to us? May we, for instance, believe that the prior's letter is genuine? I should think so; but, I must say, rather from internal evidence than on his authority; and perhaps, without entering upon technical reasons for the opinion, I may say, that I believe the date from Strasburgh to be merely a blind, and that the book was printed in London. With regard to deception of that kind, it is notorious that the puritan party had no scruple.

Having said thus much of Cambridge, and Cambridge men, let me (to borrow Strype's words) "here take in . . . .

"what progress the other University of Oxford made about the same time also in religion; Thomas Garret, Curate of Honey-lane, London, and who was burnt in the same fire with Dr. Barnes, was the great instrument thereof there. Who brought thither sundry books in Latin, treating of the Scripture, with the first part of 'Unio Dissidentium,' and Tyndal's first translation of the New Testament; which was about the year 1525, or 1526; which books he sold at Oxon, and dispersed them among the students. Cardinal Wolsey and the Bishop of London had intelligence of this man, and that he had a number of these heretical books, as they called them, and that he was gone to Oxford to vend them; and a privy search was intended to be made for him in that University. But one Cole, of Magdalen college, afterwards Cross-bearer unto the Cardinal, gave secret warning of this to a friend or two of Garret's, and advised them to persuade him to be gone. And now a great many in Oxon became suspected in religion; as they might well be; for they fell very hard upon reading these books, and gathered much light in religion from them; namely, *Delaber, of Alban hall;* Clark, Sumner, Bets, Taverner, Radley, Frith, Cox, Drum, and others, of St. Frideswyde's college, or the Cardinal's college, now Christ's Church; Udal, and Diet, and others, of Corpus Christi; Eeden of

Magdalen college; others of Glocester college; two monks of St. Austin's, of Canterbury, named Lungport; and John Salisbury, of St. Edmond's Bury; two White Monks of Bernard college; two Canons of St. Mary's college, one whereof was Robert Farrar, afterwards a Bishop and a martyr; and divers more."—*Mem.* Vol. I. P. i. p. 569. 8vo edit.

The person to whom I wish to direct the reader's attention is the first named of Garret's disciples, who became the historian of some of his proceedings. "The story of Thomas Garret or Garrerd, and of his trouble in Oxford, testified and recorded by Anthony Dalaber, who was there present the same time," is given at great length by Fox in his Martyrology[5]; but a brief outline of it may suffice for our present purpose, as our business lies not so much with the hero of the story, as with the historian.

About the year 1526, Master Garret, as we have just learned from Strype, came to Oxford, bringing with him sundry books in Latin, treating of the scripture, with the first part of "Unio dissidentium," and Tyndall's first translation of the New Testament; and, moreover, it was not unknown to Cardinal Wolsey, and to the Bishop of London, and to other of that ungodly generation, that M. Garret had a great number of these books, and that he was gone to Oxford to make sale of them there to such as he knew to be the lovers of the gospel. They determined, therefore, to apprehend him; but their purpose becoming known to him and his friends, it was agreed that he must fly.

Anthony Dalaber, the narrator, was at that time a scholar of Alban's Hall, and resident in the university; but he had lately been in his "country in Dorsetshire at Stalbridge;" and his brother, who was parson of that parish, being in want of a curate, had desired that he would send him one from Oxford. Whereupon, as he proceeds to state,

"it was thought good among the brethren (for so did we not only call one another, but were indeed one to another,) that Master Garret changing his name, should be sent forth with my letters into Dorsetshire to my brother, to serve him there for a time, until he might secretly convey himself from thence some whither over the

[5] Edition of 1596, p. 1089, but some few particulars which Fox omitted in his later editions are taken from Messrs. Seeley's edition, vol. v. p. 421, &c. I trust that no reader will understand me as vouching for the correctness of the reprint; but the matter is so trifling that it is not worth while to seek after the very scarce original edition of Fox.

sea. According hereunto I wrote my letters in all haste possible unto my brother, for Master Garret to be his curate, but not declaring what he was indeed; for my brother was a rank papist, and afterwards was the most mortal enemy that ever I had, for the gospel's sake."

It is curious to speculate on what may be contained in the scheme of Garret's taking a curacy under such a rank papist. One would like to know what his friends expected him to do, and how he himself expected to get on, under such circumstances; and perhaps we may doubt, when we find Anthony playing such a trick on his brother, whether the enmity of the parson of Stalbridge was purely "for the gospel's sake." Fox makes the best of the matter by putting in the margin, "brother against brother," which it certainly was, however we may doubt the propriety of the allusion.

"So," continues Dalaber, "the Wednesday in the morn-'ing before Shrovetide, Master Garret departed out of 'Oxford towards Dorsetshire, with my letters for his new 'service. How far he went, and by what occasion he so 'soon returned, I know not." But so it was that Garret did come back to Oxford during the night of the succeeding Friday, and going to the house where he had previously lodged, he was there apprehended by the proctors; and the next morning delivered to Dr. Cottisforde, Master of Lincoln College, and Commissary of the University, who kept him as prisoner in his chamber.

"Of all this sudden hurley-burley," says Dalaber, "was I 'utterly ignorant, so that I knew neither of Master Garret's 'so sudden return, neither that he was so taken." In fact, Dalaber had been much occupied in changing his lodging; and, having worked hard at removing his "poor stuff" from Alban's Hall to Gloucester College, where he had taken a chamber for the purpose of studying the civil law, until the Saturday afternoon, he had sat down to read the only book which he had there—Francis Lambert's on the gospel of St. Luke. "All my other books," he says, "written on the scripture, of which I had a great number, 'as of Erasmus, of Luther, of Œcolampadius, &c., I had yet 'left in my chamber at Alban's Hall, where I had made a 'very secret place to keep them safe in, because it was so 'dangerous to have any such books." So he sat diligently

reading, and meaning to do so "until even-song time at Frideswide college," when he was disturbed by repeated and violent knocking at the door; and, at length, on opening it "there was Master Garret as a man amazed;" and "one with him" who, however, turned out to be only a servant in Gloucester college, who had acted in the capacity of guide to point out Dalaber's rooms.

Master Garret, not duly considering, "spake unadvisedly," and "said he was undone, for he was taken." After the guide was gone the terrified Dalaber exclaimed, "Alas! 'Master Garret, by this your uncircumspect coming unto 'me and speaking so before this young man, you have dis-'closed yourself and utterly undone me." But what was done could not be helped; so Garret explained that the Commissary and all his company having gone to even-song, leaving him alone, he "hearing nobody stirring in the college, put back the bar of the lock with his finger" and came off. Dalaber was frightened at the idea that both were at the mercy of the young man who had acted as guide, and it seemed quite clear that Garret must not stay one moment where he was. He proposed to go into Wales, and from thence, if possible, to Germany; and, after taking an affectionate leave of Dalaber, who did what he could, though not so much as they both wished, to disguise him, he went his way.

As soon as he was gone, Dalaber shut up his rooms, and set off to communicate the intelligence to the brethren.

"Then," says he, "I went straight to Frideswide and even-song was begun, and the Dean and the other canons were there in their grey amices: they were almost at Magnificat before I came thither. I stood at the quier door, and heard Master Taverner play. . . . as I thus stood in cometh Dr. Cottisford, the commissary, as fast as ever he could go, bare-headed, as pale as ashes (I knew his grief well enough) and to the Dean he goeth into the choir, where he was sitting in his stall, and talked with him very sorrowfully: what, I know not; but whereof I might and did well and truly guess. I went aside from the quier door, to see and hear more. The Commissary and Dean came out of the quier wonderfully troubled, as it seemed. About the middle of the church met them D. London, puffing, blustering, and blowing, like an hungry and greedie lion seeking his prey."

It is a pity to spoil a story which is really so graphic and interesting; but I must curtail it, and briefly say that Dalaber spent the evening with his friends at Corpus

Christi College, and slept in his old quarters at Alban Hall. He rose early in the morning and went to Gloucester College, where he was surprised to find the gates shut, contrary to custom.

"Then," says he, "did I walk up and down by the wall there, a whole hour before the gates were opened. In the meanwhile my musing head being full of forecasting cares, and my sorrowful heart flowing with doleful sighs, I fully determined in my conscience before God, that if I should chance to be taken and be examined, I would accuse no man, nor declare any thing further than I did already perceive was manifestly known before."

In short, he found that his rooms had been broken open and searched; he was taken, and was examined by Anthony Dunstan, a monk of Westminster, who was prior of the students.

"He asked me," says Delabar, "if Master Garret were with me yesterday? I told him 'Yea.' Then he would know where he was, and wherefore he came unto me. I told him, I knew not where he was, except he were at Woodstock. For so (said I) he had showed me that he would go thither, because one of the keepers there, his friend, had promised him a piece of venison to make merry withal the Shrovetide; and that he would have borrowered a hat and a pair of high shoes of me, but I had none indeed to lend him. *This tale I thought meetest, though it were nothing so.*"

After some further discourse the chief beadle came to summon Dalaber to attend the Commissary, whom he found with the dean of Cardinal's College, and the warden of New College, at the altar of Lincoln College chapel. After they had asked him a good many questions, chiefly respecting himself,

"one came," he says, "unto them who was sent for, with pen, ink, and paper. I trow it was the clerk of the University. As soon as he was come, there was a board and tressels, with a form for him to sit on, set between the doctors and me, and a great mass-book laid before me; and I was commanded *to lay my right hand on it*, and to swear that I should truly answer unto such articles and interrogatories as I should be by them examined upon. I made danger of it awhile at first, but afterwards being persuaded by them, partly by fair words, and partly by great threats, I promised to do as they would have me; *but in my heart nothing so meant to do.* So I laid my hand on the book, and one of them gave me my oath, and that done commanded me to kiss the book."

On being afterwards examined by Dr. London, he repeated the fabrication about Woodstock and the venison, and to that, notwithstanding their threats and promises, he

adhered. "Then," he adds, "was he that brought Master 'Garret unto my chamber brought before me, and caused to 'declare what Master Garret said unto me at his coming to 'my chamber; but I said plainly, *I heard him say no such 'thing;* for I thought my *nay* to be as good as his *yea*, 'seeing it was to rid and deliver my godly brother out of 'trouble and peril of his life."

These stories do not appear to me to require much comment; and it will be more to the purpose,—at all events, should be a prior business,—to show, by the production of others like them, that these are not singular cases.

ESSAY II.

PURITAN VERACITY. No. II.

THOMAS GREENE—JOHN CARELESS.

"UNE chose des plus embarrassantes qui s'y trouve," said Pascal's Mentor, "est d'éviter *le mensonge*, et surtout quand on voudroit bien faire accroire une chose fausse;" and then, after giving him some light on the "doctrine des *equivoques*," he proceeded to explain what must be done in cases where equivocation would not do, and quoted the doctrine of Sanchez concerning "la doctrine des *restrictions mentales*"—"On peut jurer, dit-il, qu'on n'a pas fait une chose, quoiqu'on 'l'ait faite effectivement, en entendant en soi-même qu'on ne 'l'a pas faite un certain jour, ou avant qu'on fût né, ou en 'sous-entendant quelque autre circonstance pareille, sans 'que les paroles dont on se sert aient aucun sens qui le 'puisse faire connoître. Et cela est fort commode en beau-'coup de rencontres, et est toujours très juste quand cela 'est nécessire ou utile pour la santé, l'honneur, ou le bien."

There is certainly something very natural in the pupil's question, "Comment! mon père, et n'est-ce pas là un *mensonge*, et même un parjure?" and he must have been relieved by the answer: "Non, dit le père: Sanchez le 'prouve au même lieu, et notre père Filiutius aussi, tr. 25, 'chap. xi., n. 331; parce, dit-il, que c'est 'l'intention que

'règle la qualité de l'action.' Et il y donne encore, n. 328, 'un autre moyen plus sûr d'éviter le mensonge. C'est 'qu'après avoir dit tout haut, 'Je jure que je n'ai point fait 'cela,' on ajoute tout bas, 'aujourd'hui:' ou qu'après avoir 'dit tout haut 'Je jure' on dise tout bas, 'que je dis,' et 'que l'on continue ensuite tout haut 'que je n'ai point fait 'cela.' Vous voyez bien que c'est dire la vérité[1]."

Had it then existed, one might have supposed Anthony Dalaber to have been brought up in this school, and to have profited therein greatly, if one had known the facts of the case, and been present when he was called on to swear that he would tell the truth, and when, as he himself states, "I 'promised to do as they would have me; but in my heart 'meant nothing so to do. So I laid my hand on the book, 'and one of them gave me my oath, and that done, com-'manded me to kiss the book."

It is not, however, my purpose to discuss the facts stated in the preceding number: and therefore, on the cases of George Joye and Anthony Dalaber, I will here offer only a single remark, which has respect to the use which we are authorized to make of them as testimonies of puritan doctrine. George Joye was his own historian, apparently his own publisher, and perhaps even his own printer; and therefore did what he did, and wrote what he wrote, so far as we have any evidence, without the concurrence of any other person. And therefore, when he says, "I was so bold to make the scribe a lye," and explains to us that he did it on a general principle, "for I never trusted Scribes nor Pharisees," we have only his personal opinion and practice as to the matter of truth-telling. Of course such an opinion from such a man, so openly and gratuitously stated, such a fact related by him after all danger was past, in a manner which savours of anything but shame or compunction—is very weighty and important. Such I doubt not the reader will consider it.

As to Dalaber's case, however, he is indeed his own historian, so far forth as to give the story all the interest and all the authority of autobiography; but for its publication we are indebted to another hand. I am not aware that Fox any where states how the memoir came into his posses-

[1] Les Provinciales, Lett. IX. tom. i. p. 163.

sion; but as he informs us that Dalaber lived until the year 1562, it is very possible that he may have received it immediately from the author. Under most circumstances it might be too much to assume that the editor, or publisher, of Dalaber's story approved of his conduct; but when we consider the whole case, it is perhaps natural to suppose that if Fox had disapproved of that conduct, or had expected it to be blamed by his party, he would have omitted or qualified, or at least given some intimation of his disapproval.

But we shall get rid of the necessity for such speculations if we take one or two stories related by Fox respecting his own contemporaries. Thomas Greene has furnished a curious piece of autobiography, which Fox introduces thus:—

"Next, after these two above specified [Richard Wilmot and Thomas Fayrefaxe], followeth the beating of one Thomas Greene, who in the time of Queene Mary, was caused likewise to be scourged and beaten by Dr. Story. What the cause was, heere followeth in story and examination to be seene, which he penned with his owne hand, as the thing itselfe will declare to the reader. The copy and words of the same as he wrote them, heere follow. Wherein, as thou mayst note (gentle reader) the simplicitie of the one, so I pray thee, marke the cruelty of the other part."—*Edit.* 1596, p. 1868.

Let us then look a little at the "simplicity" of Thomas Greene. It seems that he was the prentice of John Wayland, a well-known printer, who brought him before Dr. Story on account of a certain book called "Antichrist," which had been clandestinely put in circulation, (or, as Thomas Greene himself expresses it, "distributed to certain honest men,") to the great annoyance of the government, who were actively engaged in searching after the persons by whom these inflammatory and seditious libels were brought into the country, and dispersed.

As to the book, however, thus incidentally mentioned, I do not wish to say much at present; because it belongs to another part of the subject. But things will not always wait until they are wanted; and, indeed, considering the false colouring which has been given to such stories, (by which it has come to pass that people take it almost for granted that whoever was punished by a papist was a true lover of the gospel,) it is necessary to the understanding of Thomas Greene's story, to observe that the work which

he was accused of clandestinely distributing was not one of merely practical piety, or polemical divinity, or even one abusing the pope and all popery; but one of a large class of books, the object (or to speak with the utmost stretch of charity, the tendency) of which was to set the commons against the nobility, and produce a revolution in the government.

It may be difficult, in the present day of licentious freedom, to form any idea of what is meant by a seditious libel, and we may think it very hard that men should be punished for printing and publishing any thing whatsoever that comes into their heads, or will put pence in their pockets. Into these questions I do not here enter, but merely state the fact that, in the days of Queen Mary, (to say nothing of her father, brother, or sister,) the government did punish the fomenters of sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion, and that to call this persecution for the gospel's sake is, in my mind, by no means proper. I hope to say something of both the politics and the provocations of the puritan party, in which this may be established and illustrated; but in the mean time I would observe, that owing to our having received almost all that is popularly known of things and persons belonging to the period of the Reformation from puritan sources—either from those who actually belonged to the sect when it was a struggling sect, or those who subsequently held them in great admiration, and gave them implicit credit —we are, of course, liable so far to adopt their views, as that we are prepared to allow much more liberty to one side than the other. It is very natural that Fox, rejoicing in Elizabethan protestantism, should laugh in his sleeve while he told how "wily Winchester" or "bloody Bonner" was "prettily nipped" by some ignorant protestant or saucy mechanic; and it is not perhaps to be wondered at, that good Mr. Strype, reposing in the shades of Low Layton, with the most perfect confidence that all the puritan party were truly striving for the gospel, should tell us, with a quaint smile, how somebody "laid it close in" to the nobility and gentry, and what clever things "were smartly thrown in their teeth by the *best sort*."

But, as far as I can judge, even by the "best sort," men of rank, and persons high in authority, either in church or state, do not like to be "prettily nipped," or to have things

"smartly thrown in their teeth;" and in particular, "the nobility, those of the Queen's Council, and the rest," to whom, according to Strype, the author of Antichrist "directed his book especially," do not like to be publicly told, that if they do not mind what they are about, the people will rise and crush them. They positively dislike it, even though it be put in the form of a prayer, that the oppressed commons may not do anything so very improper. If the Queen's Council could have had a moment's doubt as to the threat conveyed in the following passage, of this book which (if Strype is right) Thomas Greene was circulating, there were but too many helps to the clear understanding of it almost daily issuing from the foreign, or the secret, press:—

"To what truth and what religion may the subjects of this realm hereafter cleave, and assuredly, without wavering follow; which do perceive that your lordships, contrary to your own commandment heretofore, made and directed to them, do fly and retire from the doctrine and true use of the sacraments, that you, in so little time past, did most worthily approve to be most godly and necessary to be taught and followed? *God grant that the Commons of this realm, that now murmur and grudge at this inconstancy, and other your evil doings, do not hereafter burden you with the same;* and especially for your flying from the true religion, which you did before all men approve to be most godly: from the which ye be now fled, to the great dishonour of God. Wherefore God, by his prophet, *threateneth you to bring you to dishonour*, saying, 'I will give them honour that honoureth me, and they that dishonour me, will I *bring to dishonour*.' Thus," adds Strype, "this fickleness in the gentry and nobility of those times was smartly thrown in their teeth by the best sort."—*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 444.

There was certainly something smart in this. The sound was no more uncertain than the blast of Knox's trumpet. Probably there was more, and worse, of the same kind in the book, the contents of which I know only by Strype's extracts. Our business with it at present, however, arises from its being the book which Thomas Greene, the prentice, was charged with circulating, and it is hoped that the reader will understand his notable "simplicitie" the better, from my having given him what Strype would have called "a taste of it."

On being asked where he got the book, Thomas Greene told Dr. Story that he had it of a Frenchman, and that he "would tell him no more and *could* not." The doctor explained to him, at once, that it was no matter of *religion*

for which he was called in question—"he said, It was *no heresy* but *treason;* and that I should be hanged, drawn, and quartered"—but as he found him resolved to make no disclosure, he sent him to Lollard's Tower.[2] Before he had been there two hours, however, the keeper came and removed him to the coal-house; and when there, said to his prisoner, "Tell me the truth, and I will be your friend." "And I said," adds Greene, "*I had told the truth, and could tell no other.*"

In the coal-house, Thomas Greene remained six days. "Then," he adds, "Dr. Story sent for me, and asked whether 'I would tell the truth where I had the book. I said, I had 'told him, of a Frenchman. He asked me where I came 'acquainted with the Frenchman, where he dwelt, and where 'he delivered me the book. I said I came acquainted with 'him in Newgate, I coming to my friends which were put 'in for God's word and truth's sake, and the Frenchman 'coming to his friends also, there we did talk together, and 'became acquainted one with another, and did eat and drink 'together there with our friends in the fear of God." The doctor asked whether he got the book in Newgate, and Greene replied that he did not; but that he met the Frenchman in the street, who showed him the book, and he expressed a wish to have it. Story said it was a great book, and asked whether he bought it; and on Greene's replying that he did, he charged him with having robbed his master for the purpose. Greene replied, that a little money served, for he only gave him fourpence, and a promise of twelvepence more when they should next meet.

Dr. Story proposed that he should find two sureties, and watch for this Frenchman, with a promise that he should himself be kept harmless; but Greene replied that he could not find sureties, and the doctor observing "This is but a lie," called for the keeper of the coal-house, and went away, telling his prisoner that next time he came he would make him tell a different story.

Ten days more elapsed, and then Dr. Story sent for him again, and asked if he would tell the truth? "I said," says Greene, "*I could tell him no other truth* than I had, nor would;" so he was returned to his place of imprisonment.

[2] That is, to the Bishop of London's prison at St. Paul's. I mention this because the name has been (only I believe in recent times, and quite improperly) applied to one of the towers of Lambeth Palace.

After fourteen days more, he was again sent for by Dr. Story, who had with him my lord of Windsor's chaplain, and two other gentlemen, to whom he told the story. They took Greene aside, and entreated him very gently, saying, "Tell us where you had the book, and of whom, and 'we will save you harmless. I made them answer that *I* '*had told all I could* to Dr. Story: and began to tell them 'again, but they said they knew that already."

After some conversation on his faith, Thomas Greene was remanded to the coal-house, and while imprisoned there, Bishop Bonner "coming down a pair of stairs," (which must, I suppose, have come down by the side of the coal-house,) "looked in at the grate, and asked why, and by whom, he had been put there. "I made him answer," he says, "that 'I was put in for a book called 'Antichrist' by Dr. Story. 'And he said, 'you are not ashamed to declare wherefore 'you were put in,' and said it was a very wicked book, and 'bade me confess the truth to Story. I said *I had told him* '*the truth* already; and desired him to be good to me, and 'help me out of prison, for they had kept me there long. 'And he said he could not meddle with it; Story hath 'begun it and he must end it."

Now, if what I have here related were all that we knew of the matter, it would be very unjust, and uncharitable, to suppose that Thomas Greene had said anything else than truth; but the fact is, that he seems most anxious to have it known and believed that what he had been saying was false:—"Whilst I lay yet in the Lollard's Tower, the woman 'which brought the books over being taken, and her books, 'was put in the Clink in Southwark, by Hussey, one of the 'Arches; and I, Thomas Greene, testify before God, now, 'that I neither descryed the man nor the woman the which 'I had the books of."

This Hussey sent for him; but could get nothing but what he had told Dr. Story before. "Then he was very 'angry, and said, 'I love thee well, and therefore I sent for 'thee;' and looked for a further truth, but I would tell 'him no other; whereupon he 'sent me again to Lollard's 'Tower. At my going away, he called me back again, and 'said that Dixon gave me the books, being an old man 'dwelling in Birchin-lane; and I said, he knew the matter 'better than I. So he sent me away to the Lollard's Tower,

'where I remained seven days and more. Then Master 'Hussey sent for me again, and required of me to tell him 'the truth. I told him *I could tell him no other truth than* '*what I had told Dr. Story before.* Then he began to tell 'me of Dixon, of whom I had the books, the which had 'made the matter manifest afore; and he told me of all 'things touching Dixon and the books, more than I could 'myself; insomuch that he told me how many I had, and 'that he had a sackfull of the books in his house, and knew 'where the woman lay better than I myself. *Then I saw* '*the matter so open and manifest before my face that it profited* '*not me to stand in the matter.*"

The reader might perhaps imagine that Greene was now going to tell the truth. But no such thing; it was only that the old lie being found unprofitable, a new one must be substituted.

"He asked me where I had done the books; and I told 'him *I had but one*, and that Dr. Story had. He said I 'lied, for I had three at one time, and he required me to 'tell him of one. Then I told him of one that John Beane 'had of me being prentice with Master Tottle."

Now, if after all this, and a good deal more, obstinate perseverance in lying, when the information which they wanted to get from Thomas Greene had been obtained from other sources, and the treasonable business in which he had been a petty agent had come to be fully known—if, after all this, his blood-thirsty persecutors, instead of putting him in the hands of the hangman, turned him over to the beadle, it seems to me that he got off rather better than he might have expected; and that he might think himself very lucky that his notable "simplicitie" had led him into no worse scrape, and that he was able to say, "when they had done whipping of me, they bade me pay my fees, and go my ways."

But much as we may admire the simplicity of Thomas Greene, it is surely somewhat strange to find this account of it in "The story of certain scourged for *religion*,"—a story after which Fox observes: "Besides these above named 'divers others also suffered the like scourgings and whippings 'in their bodies, for their *faithful standing in the truth;* of 'which it may be said, as it is written of the Apostles in the 'Acts, 'Which departed from the council rejoicing that they

'were counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus.'" The distinction which Fox must have made in his own mind, and expected to be made by his readers, between *truth* and *the truth*, must be kept in mind during this inquiry; and it may be feared that it was not peculiar to him, or to his times, but that it characterized the party to which he belonged, and survived the age in which he lived.

But let us turn from the "scourging of Thomas Greene, prentice," who is not a very dignified representative of his party (though Fox's admiration of his "simplicity" gives his story great importance), to the account of a person much more distinguished; one whom Strype describes as an "eminent martyr[3]:" and let us see if we can account for his practice on any other ground than that of some such distinction, leading to an idea that *the* truth was sometimes to be maintained or promoted by falsehood,—I mean, John Careless, whose letters have been published by Fox, republished by Coverdale, and, within these ten years, again republished as the "Letters of that faithful man of God, John Careless," and as part of a "precious relic of the founders of our established Church[4]."

The reader must understand, that "there were now," according to Strype, who is speaking of the year 1556, "abundance of sects and dangerous doctrines: whose main-'tainers shrouded themselves under the professors of the 'gospel. Some denied the godhead of Christ; some denied 'his manhood; others denied the godhead of the Holy 'Ghost, original sin, the doctrine of predestination and 'free election, the descent of Christ into hell, (which the

[3] Mem. of Cran. vol. ii. p. 504.

[4] These words are quoted from Mr. Bickersteth's dedication prefixed to the edition of "the Letters of the Martyrs," published in the year 1837. This work professes to be a reprint of the volume collected and published by Bishop Coverdale, in the year 1564. Three other letters of John Careless were afterwards annexed to "A Pitvovs Lamentation of the miserable estate of the chvrche," by Bishop Ridley. "Imprinted at London by William Powell, dwelling in Flete Strete, at the sign of the George, nere to Sainct Dunston's Church." They are intituled, "Certeyne godly and comfortable letters of the constant wytnes of Christ, John Careles, written in the time of his imprisonment, and now fyrste set forth in printe. Anno Domini, 1566." They were not, therefore, in the first edition of Fox; and I believe only one of them has been in any edition of the Martyrology, or reprinted anywhere. They are all addressed to the same female, K. E., who, in the edition of Fox, 1596, p. 1752, and

'protestants here generally hell,) the baptism of infants. 'Some condemned the use of all indifferent things in 'religion: others held freewill, man's righteousness, and 'justification by works—doctrines which the protestants, in 'the times of King Edward, for the most part, disowned. 'By these opinions, a scandal was raised upon the true 'professors[5].' Again, speaking of some "schismatical 'spirits" who had "imbibed principles of Pelagiani 'Arianism, and anabaptism, and endeavoured to infuse the 'same into those good men and women professing and 'suffering for the gospel," and having stated, on the authority of Fox, that "not only in private assemblies here '[*i.e.*, at Colchester] did these swarm, to pervert the right 'ways of the Lord, but also in divers prisons in London, 'they kept a continual hand: where they scattered their 'heretical doctrines among such as were committed for the 'love of the gospel;" he adds, that "some of the chief 'among them were these two—John Kemp and Henry 'Hart . . . . these were those they called *freewill men:* 'for so they were termed of the *predestinators* . . . . and 'there were thirteen articles drawn up, to be observed 'among their company that adhered to them . . . . there 'were *certain articles* of Christian religion, which Careless 'had sent to Tymms, a prisoner for the gospel in the 'King's Bench [*read* Newgate]: and these Hart undertook 'to confute[6]."

Of these particulars the reader should be aware, and he should also know, that Dr. Martin was commissioned by the council to make inquiries respecting these quarrels which were said to exist among the nonconforming

in Mr. Cattley's edition, vol. viii. p. 192, is changed to E. K. Why Fox, or whoever put the first of the three letters into the Martyrology, did not put in the other two, I do not know, except it were that the former of them is in a high strain of praise, gratitude, compliment, and full confidence—for instance, "I am right suer we are both sealed vnto the daye of redemption;" and again, "be you certaine and suer that God will likewise glorify you with himself in everlasting glory. For, as the Lord did know and elect you for his before the foundation of the worlde was layde: so hath he called you by the sincere preaching of his holy gospel" —while the principal object of the latter seems to be, to let her know that he had been informed by credible persons that she was frequently guilty of "comming into the companye of filthy idolaters, at the time of their Antechristian service."

[5] Mem. III. i. 586.

[6] Annals, vol. ii. P. ii. p. 283.

prisoners; and in the course of his investigation, Careless came before him in the custody (at least, in the company) of the marshal of the King's Bench. How, or why, Careless came to be a prisoner in the King's Bench at all, does not appear. That when he was there, he was a zealous, not to say fierce, polemic, is quite clear; but I do not see anything to show that he was originally imprisoned on account of religion. When Dr. Martin asked him where he dwelt, and was answered, "In Coventry," he rejoined, "At Coventry? what so far man? How camest thou hither? Who sent thee to the King's Bench to prison?" All that Careless thought fit to answer was, "I was brought thither by a writ, I trow; what it was I cannot tell. I think Master Marshal can tell you." "In good faith," said the Marshal, "I cannot tell what the matter is; but indeed my Lord Chief Justice sent him from the bar." The only other fact which I observe to be stated by Fox respecting his imprisonment, (which was begun before he was sent up to London,) is that, "being in Coventry jail, 'he was there in such credit with his keeper, that, upon 'his word, he was let out to play in the pageant about the 'city with his companions. And that done, keeping touch 'with his keeper, he returned into prison at his hour 'appointed[7]." However, it is quite clear, and quite enough for our present purpose, that having been previously a weaver at Coventry, he was at this time a prisoner in the King's Bench; and that we have "The effect of the Examination of John Careless before Dr. Martin, briefly declared" by the prisoner himself, and recorded in Fox's Martyrology. The document begins thus:—

"When I came into his chamber, Master D. called me to him, saying, 'Come you hither, sirrah; what is your name?' 'Forsooth,' quoth I, 'my name is John Careless.'

[7] Since the above was published I have observed two notices of John Careless in Fox's Martyrology, by one of which we learn that he was the person by whom Bishop Latimer was "premonished about six hours before" of the poursuivant's approach to summon him to London (vol. vii. p. 464, 8vo. Ed.); and by the other we are told that on "the 20 day of 'Nov., the mayor of Coventry sent up unto the lords of the Council 'Baldwin Clarke, John Careless, Thomas Wilcocks, and Richard Estelin, 'for their behaviour upon Allhallows-day last before: whereupon Care-'less and Wilcocks were committed to the Gatehouse, and Clarke and 'Estelin to the Marshalsea."—*Ibid.* vi. 411.

Dr. Martin—'Careless! by my faith I think the same; and so I ween it will appear by thy conditions, by that time we have done with thee.'

Careless—'Though my name be Careless, yet perchance you shall not find me so careless in my conditions, as your mastership doth presuppose.'

Martin—'No! that I shall prove anon. I pray thee of what church art thou, or of what faith? for I hear say that you have divers churches and faith in the King's Bench; and here I have two of your faiths which you sent to Newgate. Come hither; look upon them; and I pray thee tell me which is thy faith; for the one of them is thine, and thine own handwriting.'"

John Careless, as he had told the doctor at the outset, was far enough from being the sort of person which his name would indicate. In fact, those who are acquainted with De Foe's inimitable and "most edifying discourse between the Justice and the Weaver[8]," may be apt to think more than once of Edmund Pratt, in reading the examination of John Careless. He was not at all disposed to commit himself; so he tells us:—

"With that I came near him, saying, 'If your mastership have any thing of my handwriting, show it me, and I will not deny it.'

Martin—'Nay, marry, thou canst not deny it. Lo! here is thy own name at it.' And so he began to read it, but suddenly he stayed, saying, 'How sayest thou to it? Canst thou deny that this is thy faith, fact, and deed, and this is thine own hand?'"

Careless acknowledged that "the tenor" of the document was of his "first drawing," but absolutely denied that the copy shown to him was his handwriting, or that he knew whose handwriting it was. Whether this was true or false, how can we possibly know, when we find him going on thus:—

"Then he turned the other side of the paper, where Henry Hart had wickedly written against my true articles, *whose hand and name I knew as soon as I had seen it;* for indeed my good brother Tyms had sent me a copy of the same before. Then he said, 'Lo! here is another of thy fellows faith, clean contrary to thine: whose faith is this? Dost thou know this hand?'

Careless—'No, forsooth, *I do not know whose faith, nor yet whose hand it is,* neither will I make me any thing to do with other men's faiths. I stand here to make answer to your mastership for mine own; and if any man have wrote against the same, I would I might come to talk with him face to face, to see how he were able to prove his party good.'

Martin—'Prove! A wise proof that you would make: you will

[8] Great Law of Subordination, p. 91.

prove yourselves a sort of fools before you have all done,' and many other mocks and taunts he gave me all the time of our talk, the which I will leave out for brevity's sake. Then he said, 'Dost thou not know one Henry Hart, or hast thou not heard of him?'

Careless—'*No, forsooth; I do not know any such, nor have I heard of him, that I wot of.*'

But yet *I lied falsely;* for I knew him indeed, and his qualities too well. And I have heard so much of him, that I dare say it had been good for that man if he had never been born: for many a simple soul hath he shamefully seduced, beguiled, and deceived with his foul Pelagian opinion, both in the days of that good King Edward and since his departure, and with other things which I will forbear to name for divers considerations. But I would wish all men that be godly-wise, to beware of that man, whose opinions in many points are very noisome and wicked: God convert him, or confound him shortly, for his name's sake. Amen.

Martin—'No have, forsooth; and it is even he that hath written against thy faith. Lo! here is his name at his faith.' And then he read Hart's most blasphemous articles against those which I had written and sent to Newgate, whereunto all those twelve godly men that were last condemned had set to their hands, whom Hart, Kemp, and M. Gypson, would have persuaded from the same again; but, thanks be unto God, the serpent prevailed not."

After a good deal of discussion about "one Master Chamberlain," who had written against Careless, but whom Careless affirmed he did not know, and about the two books of Common Prayer, and the conduct of the Frankfort exiles respecting them, all which is not to our present purpose, the examination proceeds:—

"*Martin*—'Well, let it pass. I pray thee tell me what is the cause of so much contention between you that lie in the King's Bench for religion?'

Careless—'Forsooth *there is no contention amongst us, that I know of.*'

Martin—'What! wilt thou lie to me? Is there not great contention between thee and one Trew, that was here with me ere while? Yes, that there is; and I can tell thee by what token well enough. I hear say one of your matters is about predestination. How dost thou believe about predestination?'"

Careless was probably glad to evade the first and principal question, by taking up the second, to which he very prudently replied, "According to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and none otherwise;" but, after some discussion of it, the examiner returned to his point:

"*Martin*—'What other things do you contend for in the King's Bench? I pray thee, Careless, tell me the truth.'

Careless—'Surely we have *no contention* there, nor ever had, but

for this matter of predestination; and that is ended between us, many a day agone.' *This I spake to make the best of the matter;* for I was sorry that the papists should hear of our variance.

Martin—'What! will you lie indeed? I know there are a great many of other matters between you. Tell me the truth, I pray thee; for I promise thee I do ask thee for no hurt, but to do you good: for I think you will be burned all the sort of you. But yet I would send some man to you, to reform you of some of your errors.'"

Then followed some discussion, in which the doctor told Careless that he had no commission to examine him as to heresy, but was commanded by the Council to know of him what opinions were amongst them in the King's Bench, for which they did strive amongst themselves; and though Careless modestly suggested that if he wanted to know the opinions of his companions, his mastership might send for them, or send somebody to them, and at length positively declared that he could recite no man's faith or opinions but his own, yet the doctor stuck to his point:

"*Martin*—'Why, thou canst not deny but there is contention amongst you, and wilt not thou declare wherefore it is? What a fellow art thou.'

Careless—'Indeed I do not deny but there hath been some earnest reasoning amongst us, but not a great while; for *Master Marshal hath shut us asunder for the same* as much as he can, so that we can neither come nor speak together.'

Then Martin said to his clerk, Write that he saith, he doth not deny but that there is contention amongst them in the King's Bench; but he will not tell wherefore it is. But first write, that he doth confess the articles which were sent to Newgate, to be of his drawing forth first, but not of his handwriting. 'To whom didst thou send it in Newgate?'

Careless—'Forsooth to my bedfellow Tyms, that was burned yesterday.'

Martin—'Tyms! who is that? I know him not.'

Scribe—'It was one of the six that were burned yesterday.'

Martin—'Ah, very well. Was he thy bedfellow? Where was he thy bedfellow?'

Careless—'Forsooth he was one of my fellow-prisoners in the King's Bench.'

Martin—'Hast thou any more copies of these articles?'

Careless—'No, forsooth.'

Martin—'Write that he saith he sent his articles to his bedfellow Tyms, that was burned yesterday, and that he hath no more copies of them.' So that was written.

Careless—'Nay, you should have written him my couch-fellow, for we lay in no bed almost these three years, but upon a poor couch of straw.' *This I said for a good consideration, though indeed it was otherwise.* God be praised for his providence!"

Then after a long excursion the examiner comes round to the old and awkward question:—

"*Martin*—'I tell thee yet again, that I must also examine thee of such things as be in controversy between thee and thy fellows in the Kings Bench, whereof predestination is a part, as thy fellow Trew hath confessed, and thyself doth not deny it.

Careless—'I do not deny it. But he that first told you that matter, might have found himself much better occupied.'"

This led to a discussion of the prisoner's opinion about election; and an examiner of less patience and perseverance (or perhaps I should say with less previous information) might have supposed that he had got all the information that he was likely to get; but instead of that, the doctor, on his return from the excursion, and in total disregard of Careless's assurances—first, that they *did not contend at all*, and then, that they *contended* only *about predestination*—breaks up new ground, and asks:

"How say you to the two brethren that are in the Kings Bench which deny the divinity of Christ? How say you to their opinion?

Careless—O Lord! I perceive your mastership knoweth that which of all other things I wish to have been kept from you: verily he was to blame that told you of that."

Does all this require any comment? I cannot think that it does; but it seems right to add a word or two respecting its literary history, which is rather curious and instructive. The full-length examination of John Careless, from which the foregoing extracts are made, was, I believe, originally published by Fox in the first edition of his Martyrology. Whether it was reprinted in any subsequent edition, I do not know; but, as Mr. Cattley, the editor of Messrs. Seeley's edition, professes to give it from the first edition, I presume that it is not in any of the intermediate ones. Certainly, it is not in that of 1596, the only one to which I have at present opportunity to refer. In that edition, every word here quoted, except the questions and answers, as to how Careless came to be in the King's Bench at all—everything that bears the least appearance of falsehood or prevarication, is omitted; and so much of the examination as is given is introduced by a paragraph respecting the truth of which the reader will be in some degree able to judge. Fox argues, that though Careless "came not to the full martyrdom of his body," yet he ought to be placed among the martyrs—

"as well for that he was for the same truth's sake a long time imprisoned, as also for his willing mind and zealous affection he had thereunto, if the Lord had so determined it, as well may appear by his examination had before D. Martin. Which examination, because it containeth nothing almost but wrangling interrogations, and matters of contention, wherein D. Martin would enter into no communication about the articles of his accusation, but only urged him to detect his fellows[9]; it shall not be greatly material, therefore, to express the whole, but only to excerpt so much as pertaining to the question of predestination, may bring some fruit to the reader."—*Edit.* 1596, p. 1742.

Accordingly, Careless's declaration, "That God hath pre-'destinate me to eternall life in Jesus Christ, I am most 'certain, and even so am I sure that his Holy Spirit (where-'with I am sealed) will so preserve me from all heresies 'and euill opinions, that I shall not die in none at all," and a good deal of discussion of doctrine is retained; but not a word of what I have quoted, except, as I have already said, the questions and answers as to how he came to be in the King's Bench.

Whether this is putting the matter in a true light, he who has read only what is here extracted, and much more he who shall take the trouble to read the whole as it is reprinted in Messrs. Seeley's edition, will be able to judge. The editor of that edition has distinguished these parts which he has retrieved from the first edition, so that it is easy to see what it was thought good at some time or other, and by somebody or other, quietly to drop out of the book. Mr. Cattley has also in this edition done another thing which, in our present inquiry, deserves notice. On *one* passage which I have quoted he has put a note. He takes no notice of Careless's previous falsehoods, and whether he approved or disapproved them he does not state; but, when the unfortunate man declares that he "lay on no bed almost these three years," the editor is roused even to a species of protest. To be sure, one does

[9] It is quite necessary to keep clearly in mind what the "accusation' really was. When Careless said that Dr. Martin could not prove any of the articles which he had written to be heresy, and challenged him to try, the Doctor answered "But what if I should examine you of the sacra-'ment and other things: should I not find thee a heretic? Yes I trow 'I should; but *I have no commission to examine you of any such things* 'but I am commanded by the Council to know of thee what opinions are 'amongst you in the King's Bench, for the which you do *strive among* '*yourselves;* therefore look that you tell me."—*Fox*, vol. viii. p. 166.

not see why that was a greater, or in any way a worse, falsehood than declaring that he knew no such person as Henry Hart; but, for some reason or other, it seems to have more powerfully affected the editor's mind, and he puts this note:—

"This passage is not to be defended; far from it. The circumstances of the case, however, should not be lost sight of. The 'consideration' hinted at, is evidently the risk of bringing into trouble those who had contributed to his necessities, including the keeper of the prison. And it is in reference to their kindly interposition in his behalf, that Careless praises God for his 'providence.' —ED." Vol. viii. p. 167.

This, which, whatever impression it may leave on the reader, is really almost a sort of protest rather than an apology, is more than is elicited by either of the former falsehoods of John Careless, or by those of Anthony Dalaber or Thomas Greene, and more than Strype thinks it necessary to say in his account of the matter. Indeed, that account furnishes a curious specimen of the two great defects, which render the very valuable works of Strype so much less valuable than they might be—namely, prejudice and carelessness. After having mentioned the fact of Careless having written the confession, and Hart's writing on the back of it, he states that this paper—

"fell by some accident into the hands of Dr. Martin, a great papist; who took occasion hence to scoff at the professors of the gospel, because of these divisions and various opinions amongst them. But Careless, before the said Martin, disowned Hart, and said that he had seduced and beguiled many a simple soul with his foul Pelagian opinions, both in the days of King Edward, and since his departure."—*Cran.* vol. ii. p. 505.

Is it not strange that Strype, while referring so specially and particularly to the plainest and most clearly acknowledged falsehood of Careless, should so gloss it over? He "disowned Hart." Who would understand that phrase to mean, that he declared most falsely that he had never so much as heard that any such person as Hart existed? Especially followed as it is—he "disowned Hart, and said that he had seduced," &c. Of course Careless said nothing so absurd, and so plainly contradictory of that profession of entire ignorance which he had just made. If the reader looks back to the third extract which I have just made from the examination, he will see that what Strype quotes

about Hart's seducing and beguiling, is not what Careless said to Dr. Martin, but what he thought fit to observe by way of comment, when he was writing an account of his examination. The evil arises, of course, merely from want of care in reading and copying, and is just like his telling us that "by some accident" the paper of articles fell into the hands of Dr. Martin, when in the next paragraph he tells us that the noise of "such unseemly quarrelsome disputes and heat" reached to "the Council . . . who sent Dr. Martin to the King's Bench to examine it[10]." And when, in the examination itself, he had Dr. Martin's own words, "I tell thee, then, I have commission, yea, and commandment from the Council, to examine thee, for *they delivered me thy articles.*"

But, setting this aside for the present, let me recal the reader's attention to the four cases which I have mentioned. It seems to me to be quite time to ask him whether they prove anything? If not, perhaps no multiplication of such stories would avail to throw any light on the puritan doctrine respecting veracity. Let me, however, remind him of one thing—namely, that I am not charging Joye, and Dalaber, and Greene, and Careless with falsehood, or attempting to show that they were guilty of it, but merely bringing forward their own statements, respecting their own conduct, made for their own pleasure, and, without the least mark of regret or compunction, addressed to their own friends, and in three cases out of the four, set forth and

[10] Cran. ii. 505. I have no wish to cavil at what Strype says, and I think no one feels more strongly than I do the value of his work; but really it is one great inconvenience of the careless way in which he wrote, that one cannot bring one passage to correct another, without a high probability of its containing something in itself which needs correction. It may be a matter of no importance whether Dr. Martin went to the King's Bench, or whether Careless was brought before him elsewhere; but that anybody who had read the examination should affirm the former, seems very strange. The first words (as the reader will see by turning back a page or two) are, "When I came into *his chamber*, Master D. called me to him," &c.; and in the course of the examination, Dr. Martin having asked him, "Where dost thou dwell?" Careless answered, "Forsooth at Coventry." The Doctor rejoined, "At Coventry? What so far, man? How camest thou *hither?* [and then, as if sensible that this word might be misunderstood to mean the place where they actually were at the moment, he added] Who sent thee to the King's Bench to prison?" And Careless answered, "I was sent *thither* by a writ," &c. How could Strype imagine that this dialogue took place *in* the King's Bench?

published by those friends without the least hint of disapprobation. If he duly considers this point, he will, I think, acquit me of any want of justice or charity towards either the individuals or their sect; and will not wonder or blame me if I proceed to inquire what effect the doctrine thus developed had on some of those writers who, whether formally or not, are in fact the Historians of the Reformation.

ESSAY III.

PURITAN STYLE. No. I.

BALE.

WHAT kindled and fanned the fires of Smithfield? What raised and kept alive the popish persecution in the days of Queen Mary? Was it her own sanguinary disposition? or was she the slave of her husband's cruel superstition? or were both the tools of foreigners, who certainly hated the English because they were heretics, but more deadly hated the heretics because they were Englishmen? Was it "wily Winchester," or was it "bloody Bonner," or was it something in the spirit of the church of which both were zealous members?

Whatever may be said on any or on all of these points, there was undoubtedly one other cause; which, if it be too much to say that it has been studiously concealed or disguised, has certainly never occupied that prominent place to which it is entitled in such an inquiry. I mean, the bitter and provoking spirit of some of those who were very active and forward in promoting the progress of the Reformation —the political opinions which they held, and the language in which they disseminated them—the fierce personal attacks which they made on those whom they considered as enemies —and, to say the least, the little care which was taken by those who were really actuated by religious motives, and seeking a true reformation of the church, to shake off a lewd, ungodly, profane rabble, who joined the cause of protestantism, thinking it in their depraved imaginations, or

hoping to make it by their wicked devices, the cause of liberty against law, of the poor against the rich, of the laity against the clergy, of the people against their rulers.

In particular, it seems impossible that any reflecting mind, even though misled by partial relations, or prejudiced by doctrinal opinions, should fail to see, as a mere matter of fact, in how great a degree the persecution of the protestants in England was caused by the conduct of their brethren who were in exile. To this point in particular I beg the reader's attention.

No man, I suppose, will blame those who, when they were persecuted in their own country, fled to another. Perhaps a severe scrutiny might discover that in a great many cases politics (what some called treason) had more to do with their flight than religion; but, to say nothing of this, it was natural that men who felt that they were in danger of their lives if they worshipped God as they thought right, or refused to obey Antichrist by the commission of what they considered atrocious idolatry, should quit the scene of danger and throw themselves upon the hospitality of foreigners. They did so, and with the happiest success. Banishment from one's country is, no doubt, a hardship in itself, and in the case of many it was probably attended with risk, trouble, and loss; but one would have thought that when the exiles found themselves beyond the reach of persecution, and received with hearty welcome, and fraternal love, by those whom they considered as brethren in their common Lord, they would have sate down under the banner of love thus mercifully spread over them, and poured out their hearts in gratitude and praise to the God of all consolation[1]. We

[1] In his account of Bishop Parkhurst, Strype says, "He and the other 'exiles being not only most kindly received at their coming, by Bullinger, 'Zanchy, Wolphius, Gualter, Lavater, and other ministers and rectors at 'Zurich, but also living easily there among them; so much love and 'hospitality had such an impression upon him, that he thought he could 'never sufficiently extol it, nor be thankful enough for it: as he expressed it in these verses:

Vivo Tigurinos inter humanissimos:
Quibus velis vix credere quantum debeam.
O! quando Tigurinis reponam gratiam?

"How kind the divines of that city showed themselves (and especially Gualter) to him, John Bale took notice of in the preface to his books 'of the Acts of the Popes . . . . the same writer, an exile also then

might, surely, have expected that, if their Christianity did not rise high enough to enable them to bless those who cursed them, and to pray for those who despitefully used and persecuted them, they would at least have tried to forget their own injuries for the sake of the brethren whom they had left behind, and who, either because they were unable, or because they scrupled, to fly, were still exposed to the fury of Antichrist—that if they addressed anything to the rulers of Eng-

at Basil, records gratefully the entertainment of the rest of the English 'there. That they lived together in one house [like a college of students.] 'That Bullinger took a fatherly care of them, and that by the full con-'sent of the citizens. And he adds, that these that were daily with him 'at Basil, related those ministers care, their trouble, and their paternal 'affection towards them, while they lived under the shadow of that city, 'covered against the heat of persecution with the love of the whole 'people."—*Annals*, Vol. II. P. i. p. 348.

Since this note was first published I have been led to suspect that Parkhurst's demonstrations of gratitude may have been somewhat exaggerated at the expense of his contemporaries. In addition to what I have quoted above, Strype says, "He had a great sense of the favour 'and protection he received in Helvetia, especially of the learned men of 'Zurich . . . . and so delighted was he with the discipline and doctrine 'of that church, that he often wished that our church were modelled 'exactly according to that. And in gratitude to Rodolph Gualter (in 'whose house he and his wife seem to have been harboured) he maintained his son the young Rodolph first at Cambridge, and then at Oxford and in other places, while he was in England at his *sole expence*," &c.—*Ibid.* p. 508. It happened that after I had published these Essays, in clearing out a closet in the MSS. Room at Lambeth, I found a parcel, which had been tied up before I was born, and probably never opened since. Its superscription was not particularly inviting, or such as to give it a preference in a collection where it was impossible to pay due attention to so many things that were obviously and highly interesting. One only learned that the dirty brown paper contained "Old Petitions," &c. which the person who put them up characterized as "Useless." Being however at that time very desirous to know as accurately as possible the contents of the room I opened the parcel; and, among old petitions and the like, I found the autograph Account Book kept by Archbishop Whitgift when he was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. By the Archbishop's permission I gave some description of it, and reprinted the whole in the British Magazine for October, 1847, and some subsequent numbers. Among the pupils whose accounts were kept by the Master in this book was this "young Rodolph," and it seems to render the statement in Strype somewhat doubtful. I do not here repeat what I said in the magazine for February, 1848 (vol. xxxiii. p. 192,) but it is curious that while the Master acknowledges and accounts for monies received for the young foreigner's support from "my l. of London" [Sandys] and "my l. of York" [Grindal], there is no reference of any kind to my Lord of Norwich.

land it would be the language of earnest intercession for those brethren—that if they wrote to those brethren themselves, it would be to excite them to faith, hope, and charity, to long-suffering, patience, and resignation, and to invite them to those safe and pleasant cites of refuge which a merciful God had provided and prepared for them.

Those who have penetrated at all beneath the general and superficial statements of the popular historians, need not be told that the real case was much otherwise. But I cannot help thinking, that none but those who have paid some attention to the works which were written by the exiled party during the reign of Mary,—I mean the works themselves, in contradistinction to selections, extracts, modernizations, and generalizing accounts,—can properly estimate the effect which they were calculated to produce on the measures of the English government in church and state during that period. Before, however, I come to speak particularly of these works, as regards their design and effect, I would offer a few remarks of a more general nature on the style of some of the more popular puritan writers. It is a matter which has certainly been misrepresented, principally, I believe, though not entirely, by ignorance; but it is one which, if we wish really to understand the history of the period, we must look fairly in the face.

It must be considered that those parts of the works of writers of this class and period, which are the most contrary to good taste and good manners, have been very seldom, very sparingly, and then commonly with some preface or apology, brought forward by their admirers;—and further that through those admirers almost exclusively, these writers are known to protestants of the present day; and further still, that when any such matter as admirers would not wish to find does come into notice, it is frequently purified from its grossness by the omission of words or sentences, with or without notice to the reader, who thus forms a very imperfect and erroneous opinion of the author whose work he is reading. Of course, I do not mean to find fault with such omissions, as things wrong in themselves, or as less than absolutely necessary in some cases. Occasions may arise on which it may be very right to reprint a work, or extract a passage, of an old writer, containing words or phrases so obscene or profane that common decency requires them to be

expunged. This too, may probably be done without any injury to the purpose for which the reprint or extract is made, and if it be fully acknowledged, it is hardly likely to lead to any ill consequence. But when without notice, or with a notice that is false, and even with the very best intentions, that which would disgust is tacitly altered, or omitted, and a coarse, obscene, or scurrilous writer is weeded and cleared of his offences, and made to look quite innocent, it is obvious that whatever informatian or instruction we may gain from his writings thus garbled, we shall get a very wrong idea of himself, his style, and his admirers.

But where this expurgation of a writer cannot be fully effected, there is one standing excuse for a favourite writer which may pass current for everything that is offensive, whatever be its kind or degree—that is, the manners of the age. Only take that with you—take it, perhaps, from some writer who repeats the phrase like a parrot, without knowing anything about the age or its manners or language—take it only on trust as a phrase to which you do not, perhaps, yourself affix a very clear idea, and it is sufficient to cover any sin against propriety and decorum, and almost religion. With this salvo you may be expected to read with edification such things as if spoken or written in the present day would be considered absolutely ungodly and profane.

If, however, we wish to form a true judgment, this point must be looked into and settled. It is quite clear that some words and phrases which were in common use three hundred years ago, and which had then no character of coarseness, would be considered intolerably gross in the present day; but this, really, has nothing to do with the matter now under consideration. No more has any notion that may have been set on foot respecting the free, blunt, plain speech of our forefathers. It is not with coarse words or plain speech as such that we are concerned; though, at the same time, the use of coarse language in particular circumstances and to particular persons must be taken into account. I suppose, for instance, that there never was a period in the history of the united Church of England and Ireland when it would have been thought quite common-place and Christian for the Bishop of Ossory deliberately, and in print, to address the Bishop of London as a "beastlye belly-god and dampnable donge-hille."

But one of the most material, and in an historical point of view most injurious, effects of this sort of misrepresentation is, that it comes to be taken for granted that the fierce and virulent scurrility of some of the puritan libels, which cannot be entirely concealed or defended, even by the most thorough-going partizans, was not characteristic of the writers, but of the times. Bishop Burnet is even kind enough to make a sort of an excuse for Sir Thomas More, by saying, "he wrote according to the *way of the age* with much bitterness[2];" and so the bishop's readers may naturally infer that, whatever may be meant by "*much* bitterness," and whatever degree of it may be found in Sir Thomas More's works, it belonged not to the man, but was "the way of the age"—that it was the way of people in those days; very wrong, no doubt, but at the same time as good for one as for another; the puritans abused the papists, and the papists abused the puritans, tit for tat. As if Sir Thomas More and John Bale were as like as two peas.

Now, as far as I have yet been able to learn, this is really a false view of things. It is true enough that each party abused the other, and that many keen, severe, false, and malicious things were put forth by the Romish party; but for senseless cavilling, scurrilous railing and ribaldry, for the most offensive personalities, for the reckless imputation of the worst motives and most odious vices; in short, for all that was calculated to render an opponent hateful in the eyes of those who were no judges of the matter in dispute, some of the puritan party went far beyond their adversaries. I do not want to defend the Romish writers, and I hope I have no partiality for them, or for the errors, heresies, and superstitions which they were concerned to maintain; but it really appears to me only simple truth to say that, whether from good or bad motives, they did in fact abstain from that fierce, truculent, and abusive language, and that loathsome ribaldry, which characterized the style of too many of the puritan writers. Specimens will frequently appear as other occasions may require; but here, and merely for the sake of illustrating what I have already said on the subject of *style*, I will give a few extracts from the works of three eminent puritan writers, who may fairly be classed among

[2] Hist. of Ref. vol. i. p. 31.

the leaders of the party, not only on account of the eminent stations which they held, but for the talents and learning for which they have had credit, both among their own contemporaries, and from more modern writers. These extracts may probably suggest a good many things of various kinds to the reflecting reader, but it must be observed that they are here given only as specimens of *style*, denoting the character of certain writers; and those who are previously acquainted with the works of the writers in question, will be aware that, for obvious reasons, I do not quote passages which would but too broadly confirm what I have stated.

As I have already alluded to John Bale, Bishop of Ossory, and as he may perhaps be on the whole the fittest person to take the lead on such an occasion, I will first give some passages from his pen. Let not the reader who knows him be startled. I am not going even to mention some of his filthiest productions, or to extract the worst parts of that one work from which I now take specimens of his style. It is perhaps hardly necessary to state that Bale, after having been a Carmelite friar, attached himself to the party of the Reformation, married, became chaplain to Ponet, Bishop of Winchester, and was afterwards, by King Edward VI., appointed Bishop of Ossory. On the accession of Queen Mary, he was glad to fly from Ireland. During her reign he remained in exile beyond sea, and after her death, instead of going back to his diocese, he "contented himself," as Strype expresses it, "with a prebend at Canterbury."

We are, however, at present concerned with his performances while he was in exile, and when the Marian persecution in England was, as it turned out, only beginning. Whether it was mitigated or aggravated by such performances, is a question which cannot fail to force itself on the reader's mind while he reflects on the extracts now laid before him, but I cannot too often repeat that they are not *here* brought forward as proofs of any facts, or of any hypothesis, but merely as specimens of *style*.

Bishop Bonner, having been released from imprisonment and reinstated in the see of London, on the accession of Queen Mary, saw fit to visit his diocese; and "for this purpose," says Strype, "he prepared a book of Articles, 'containing thirty-seven in number; according to which

'Articles six men in every parish were to make inquiry, and 'to bring in their presentments by the 23rd of September, 'of all that had offended against them[3].' Fox having said much the same, adds, "which Articles, partly for the 'tediousness of them, partly for that Master Bale in a 'certain treatise hath sufficiently painted out the same in 'their colours, partly also, because I will not infect this book 'with them, I slip over[4]." Certainly, as a matter of policy, this was the best thing he could do; but I cite the passage as his testimonial in favour of the work in which Bale attacked them.

It appears that as soon as these Articles were published, Bale, who was at Basil, out of the reach of the Bishop of London, and the English government, fell upon them with a petulant ferocity which is really ludicrous. He wrote a book entitled "¶ A Declaration of Edmonde Bonners 'Articles, concerning the cleargye of London dyocese, 'whereby that excerable [*sic*] Antychrist is in his right 'colours reueled, in the year of our Lord a. 1554. By John 'Bale." How soon it came into England, and whether in print or manuscript, I do not know. If Bishop Bonner's Articles were printed (as they probably were) some little time before his visitation began, it seems just possible that Bale's book might be one of those mentioned by Fox as creating disturbance about that time. At all events, it was very fit company for them. He says, "About the v. day of 'October, and within a fortnight following, were diuers as 'well houshölders as servants and prentises apprehended 'and taken, and committed to sundry prisons, for the hauing 'and selling of certaine bookes which were sent into England '*by the preachers that fled into Germany* and other countreys, 'which bookes nipped a great number so neere, that within 'one fortnight there were little less than threescore im-'prisoned for this matter[5]."

Be this as it may, however, it is reasonable to suppose that Bale's "Declaration" was put in circulation either then, or very soon after. The long preface begins thus:—

"¶ Ihon Bale to the faithfull bethren of London diocese, and so fourthe to all the christen beleuers within England, Irelande, and Scotland.

[3] Mem. III. i. 216.
[4] Ed. 1596, p. 1339.
[5] Fox, ubi sup.

¶ From Basyle

Consider (dere christians) in these most wycked articles of Edmond Bonner the blody biteshepe of London, the exceading and horrible fury of Sathan in these latter daies and end of the world. The more nighe he approcheth to his ful iudgement of eternal dampnation, the more fearce and cruell are his enforcements, seking as a furious roring Lyon, by his two horned instrumentes and shauen souldiers whom he maye, through their shamelesse tirannye, for Christes uerities sake devoure."

Having then explained that Satan most commonly works by the agency of wicked men, who have become his members and instruments, he proceeds:—

"If ye axe me howe or by what meanes they become Sathans members, hys apte instrumentes and slaughtermenne, I answer you by Christes owne wordes in the sayde viii. chapter of Jhon. By that they persiste not in the manifest truthe of God, they become like to hym and are his naturall members, for he (saythe Christe) abode not in the truthe, for there is no truthe in hym. Thys toucheth all the tyraunts and cruel persecuters of Gods holy worde sence the worldes first foundacion, and out taketh [*i.e.*, excepteth] not in this our time, gagling Gardiner, bocherly Bonner and trifeling Tunstall, with other bloudy biteshepes and franticke papistes of England.

After stating that our Lord and his apostles had warned the church to expect enemies, and that in fact she had suffered from "tirannous Emprours, Idolatours, heretikes, hipocrites, popes, bishops, priestes, monkes, friers, harlots, antichristes," he adds,—

"Of whose wicked nombre, one here doth offer himself in these Articles to be sene, take good hede of hym, for it standeth you in hand.

This limme of the deuel and working tole of Sathan, bloudy Bonner, seeketh here to depriue you of faith, true doctrine, and Gods religion, all after the mischeuous example of Cain and the other rake hels, his franticke predecessoures afore rehearsed, and so to brynge you into hys most damnable snares. He pretendeth a great reformacion in the cleargye and laitye, but marke the good stuffe that he bringeth forth for it, and ye shall well perceyue, to what end he dryueth. Even to make all to the deuell, by the old rusty rules of Antichriste his own generall vicare."

These morsels are extracted from the Preface, which in the copy before me occupies nineteen pages. After it we come to the "Declaration" itself, which is in fact a commentary or exposition on the Articles. Bale seems (I say seems, because I have not the means of testing him, and I have no great faith in his honesty[6]) to behave very fairly in

[6] H. Wharton said, "I know Bale to have been so great a liar, that I

giving the Title of Bonner's Articles and all the Articles themselves at full length, with the "Declaration" of each appended to it.

"¶ The title of Boners whole boke.

"Articles to be enquyred of, in the generall visitacion of Edmund bishop of London, exersiced by him in the yeare of oure Lord 1554, in the citye and diocese of London, and set fourthe by the same for hys owne discharge towardes God and the worlde, to the honour of God, and his catholicke churche, and to the commodity and profyte of al those that eyther are good whyche he wold were al, or deliteth in goodnesse (which he wysheth to be manye) withoute anye particular grudge or displeasure, to any one good or badde within this realme, which articles he desyreth all men of theyr charitye, especially those that are of his diocese, to take with as good intent and mynde, as he the sayed byshop wysheth and desyreth, whiche is to the best. And the sayd byshop wythall desyreth all people to vnderstande, that what so euer opinyon, good or bad, hath bene deceiued[7] of him, or what so euer vsage or custome hathe bene here to fore, his onlye entent and purpose is, to doe his duety charitably, and with that loue, fauoure and respect, bothe towardes God, and euery christen person, which any bishop shuld shew to his flock in any wise.

¶ The Declaration.

An infallible truthe is it, that Ihon Salisbury, the Bishop of Carnote, wrote in his Policraticon, about iiii. hundreth yeres ago. In the churche (saithe he) do the Scribes and Pharisyes syt, layinge vppon mennes shoulders importable burthens. So franticke are the byshoppes in theyr visytacions, as thoughe wycked Sathan were goyng once againe from the face of the Lord, to whyp or to punyshe the Churche, lyke as he flagelled the mooste pacyent manne Job. Canne any thynge be spoken more plainly, concernynge these blasphemous Articles, and thys bloudye byte sheape theyr practyser? His visitation (he saith) is generall, for the citye and Diocese of London.

Woe is that citye and countrye, whyche hathe no better instructyons, than thys theefe and soule murtherer here bryngeth. But where finedeth thys bellye beaste, that wyckednesse shall dyscharge him afore god? The world he fynedeth in theese dayes, lyke to hym selfe, blasphemous and beastlye. God is not honoured by suche abhominatyons, as theese Artycles contayne, neyther yet

am not willing to take anything of that kind upon his credit."—*Strype's Cr.* II. 1052.

[Since this was written it has been stated in a very popular work, that Wharton was at one time a papist. If I felt no duty after being his successor in office, and the guardian of his papers, for so many years, I should still deem his testimony so important that I should think it right to notice the mistake. He was a bitter enemy of popery, but he loved truth.]

[7] So it stands; and it is so like Bale's humour slily to pretend little mistakes of this sort, that I do not venture to treat it as a mere misprint.

hys holye Catholicke churche furthered, thoughe the synagoge of Sathan hathe thereby a presente commodity."

It would be tedious to quote all the similar cavilling which follows; but one more extract relating to this Article I must give, for I feel quite convinced, that not one of my readers has discovered the prodigious and horrible blasphemy which the holy jealousy of Bale has detected at the very end of it. And indeed, as our present business is with style, the passage is very much to our purpose;—

"In the conclusyon, he fawneth like a wilye Foxe, and desyreth al menne to haue a good opynion of hym. Wherein he semeth to dout of hym selfe, as dyd that cursed Apostata Caine, to whome in the Preface he is most aptlye compared. His purpose is (he sayth) to do all thinges charitably, wyth loue and fauoure, respecting both God and his neighboure. And all these are manifest lies. In the end whereas he claimeth Christes herytage for hys owne flocke, and so bosteth it without al shame, he is an vsurper, an Antichriste, a thefe, and a beastly blind bussard, Christe sayd not to Peter, go feede thyne owne flocke, but, go fede my shepe. Ihon xxi. Fede Christes flocke (saith S. Peter) not for desyre of filthy lucre nor yet as ye wer lordes ouer them, &c. But, as gentle ministers. i. Pe. v. Take hede (saith s. Paule) to all the flocke, which Christ hathe purchased with his bloud. Ac. xx. Than is it Christes purchase, and not yours. His flocke, his congregacion, hys church and not yours. O wicked Antichristes and papistes, be once ashamed of your most beastly ignorance and blindnesse," &c.—f. 3.

Let us, however, proceed from the Title to the Articles themselves;—

"¶ The fyrste Article.

"Firste, whether the clargy, to geue example to the laity, haue in their liuynge, in their teachinge, and in theyr doynge, so behaued themselves, that they (in the iudgement of indyfferent persons) haue declared them selues, to searche principally the honor of God, and hys churche, the health of the soules of suche as are commytted to theyr cure and charge, the quyetnesse of theyr Parishyoners, and the wealth and honour of the kynge and Quene of this realme.

¶ The Declaration.

Here is as wise an order towardes, as maister Harry my Lord Mayres foole had been of counsell therin, or at the making therof. Ihon Popam the churche warden, and Saunder Waspe the constable, of euery paryshe, in some places as wyse as theyr mothers Apron strynges, muste answer for the clargies behauiour through al the whole diocese. For here he saith, the clargy, and not the person, Vicar, or Parishe Priest. Who euer see a more manifest mocker? An abhomination to the Lord (saith Salomon) is euery mocke. Prov. iii. In the latter dayes (saythe S. Peter) shall come mockers in deceitefulnesse, whyche wyll walcke after theyr owne lustes, dis-

daininge the Lordes promises. ii. Peter iii. The Apostle Iude sheweth euen the same in his Epistle also, by thys worde Illusores. Go we forwarde, and marke by the way, the illusions of this deceitfull iuggelar. Ihon Popam and Saundre Waspe, muste forth abrode, to seke the iudgements of personnes indifferent, ere they make answer to this firste article. A relygyous progresse. And who are these persons indifferent? Not scripture searchers, not bible readers, nor menne of christen knowledge. Neyther yet faynte Gospellers, whyche neyther are hote nor cold, for al these they greatly mistrust. But persons indyfferent, are old cankred Papistes, ignoraunte bussardes, wilful Idolatoures, and mooste wycked haters of al truthe and godlinesse. Yea, such as moste commenlye haue wiues obedyent to holy church bothe at bed and at borde, S. Cuckold saue them. For these are the good benefactours of that holy mother of theirs.

But what is the matter, that here must be so effectually answered? whether the cleargye to geue example &c. as aboue in the texte. But thys worde doynge, my Lord byteshepe maye put in hys purse, as superfluous, for it is included in the word, lyuing, which goeth afore, I see it well, I muste take paynes amonge, to teache his fatherede more wytte in orderinge his matters, wel syr, as for your liuings or doyngs, whether ye wil, we knowe them to be most fylthy and abhomynable, and youre teachinges therwith most pernicious and hurtefull to the soule. To muche tyme woulde it aske at this present to describe them. In deede your persons indifferent had nede to make aunswer to youre behoue in those poyntes, with lye and all. To search principally (ye saye) the honour of God, and the health of his church, ye would saye. I must teach ye ones again to frame your sentences, els wold ye couple your sorcerous masmongers with Gods maiestye in one honour, which we wil not take at your luciferus perswasyons. And truelye your blasphemous and Idolatrous Synagoge, is no more hys churche, than your hipocrisyes, ambicions, lies, lecheryes, and Idolatries, are hys commaunded workes. Ye seke the health of soules, euen as the deuyll hymself dothe, by the vtter contempt of Gods commaundements to bryng them to the lake of hel."—f. 6.

"¶ The Seconde Article.

Item, whether your person, vicare, or any other ministrynge as Pryest within your Paryshe haue bene, or is marryed, or taken for maryed, not yet separated from hys concubine or woman taken for wife. Or whether the same woman be deade, or yet liuynge, and beinge liuinge, whether the one resorteth to the other openlye, secreatly, or slaunderously, maintaining supporting or findeinge the same in any wise, to the offence of the people."—f. 10.

Part of the "Declaration" of this Article is as follows:—

"The holy Ghost spake it plainly to s. Paule, and told him, that the forbidding of marriage was a manifest doctrine of deuils. And should be taught by them that were fallen from the faithe, and gaue hede to sprites of error and lies, in hipocrisye, having their consyences marked with an whote yron. i. Timo. iiii. Than is it a most fit office for baudye Bonner. Is not he a brockish bore of

Babylon, a swilbol, a blockhed, a belly god? And maye not the deuils enter once again into the swine, as they did in Christes time? Matt. viii. No wher shall they find better stabilling, then with such a glorious glutton. An apter instrument to worke his cursed feates, then such a puffed up Nabal, shall sathan never obtain."—f. 12.

"¶ The Ninth Article.

Item, whether they or any of them, doth haunt, or resorte to ale-houses or tauerns otherwyse then for hys, or their honest necessity and reliefe, or repair to any disynge houses, commen bowling allies, suspect houses or places, or do haunt or use commen games or Plaies, or behave them selues otherwise unpriestly and unsemely." —f. 30.

In the "Declaration" Bale says;—

"'Whether they (saith Bonner) or any of them' &c. Than foloweth, the ghostlye exercise of these worthye curates, the greate studyes, cares, paynes, and labours, which they dayly take for the Christen soules commen wealth, and for their wholsome gouernaunce, no more vnknowen to Bonner and hys good officers, than the yonge wolues condytions, to the olde grand father wolf. Whether they do haunt tauernes (saith he) or resorte to ale houses? He speaketh not this I warand you, without greate experience of that matter neyther yet without remembraunce of his owne religyous doyngs, whan he was yet but yonge in that arte. And therefore full prudentelye, as one verye louinge to his marked cattell, and fauorable to hys oyled flock, he hath made a verye gentle prouiso, by these tearmes in the text. 'Other wyse than for his or their honeste necessity and relief.'"—f. 30. b.

Further on (after some grossness which I omit) he adds, in a way remarkably characteristic of the spirit in which the whole is written;—

"These curates notwithstanding, may not repaire to anye Disynge houses, what so euer they doe elsse in the ale houses, neyther yet resorte vnto bowlynge alleys. And a reason whye. Lest they so lose their mony, as they shall not be able to pay vs and our offycers our duetyes of couenaunt."—f. 31, 6.

"¶ The xi Article.

Item, whether ther be dwellynge, within any your paryshes, any Prieste, forrener, straunger, or other, who not (*sic*) presented to the byshop of thys diocese, or his officers, examyned and admytted by some one of them, doth take vpon hym to serue any cure, or to mynyster any Sacramentes or sacramentals within the sayde paryshe."—f. 34. b.

"¶ The Declaration.

I thought that a forrener and a straunger had bene all one. But bylike it includeth som great mistery, knowne only to his Lordshyppes politicke wisdome, that they be here reckned two. As he is a man of a great fore fatche. A Scot should not seme to be a

forrener by reason, being an Indigena or a man bred & borne wythin the yle of Britaine. Neither yet ought an Irish man to be counted a straunger, being an ancient subiect to the crowne of Englande. And as for Jack Spaniard, being as good a Christian as is eyther Turke, Jewe, or pagane, sine lux, sine crux, sine deus, after the chast rules of Rome and Florence, he must be a dweller here, ye know causes whye. Than remaine there none other forreners and straungers to be loked vpon, but Dutchmen, Danes, Italians, and frenchmenne. And they for the more parte, as much regarde the Poopes priesthode, as the deuel doth holy water after the olde prouerbe. And as for those priestes whom his Lordship calleth the 'other,' we know that by them he meaneth his own naturall countrye menne of the Englysh nacyon. They in thys miserable age, must come last of al and within theyr owne soyl, must be reckened the inferioures to all forreners and strangers, & may dwell in no paryshe, wythin London diocese. Marke hys Lordshypps honourable texte here, and ye shall soone perceyue hys good meanynge. But such is alwaies the fortune whyche Englande hath had of her vnnaturall bastards, as hys Lordshyppe is one amongest other S. Quintine bless him."—f. 35.

The charge of illegitimacy thus brought against Bonner will be found repeated again in one or two extracts which follow. The object of it was not merely to annoy the Bishop of London, but to furnish a ground for denying the validity of his orders, and, therefore, of all acts performed by him in his episcopal character. This may appear more plainly by and bye, for Bale was not the only writer who used the weapon, and Bonner not the only prelate against whom it was used. In the meantime, however, it is right to say, that it seems to have been a mere fiction; and that its falsehood appears to be unquestionably established by the testimony of Bonner's most bitter enemies. It seems, indeed, as if for the clearance of truth and the confusion of his friends, Fox had been constrained to record the following facts, by which he only intended to illustrate "the courtesie of Ridley and the currishness of Boner." He tells us that he had them from George Shypside, the husband of Bishop Ridley's sister. In his account of that prelate he says, "now remaineth a word or two to be declared of his 'gentle nature and kindly pitty in the vsage of an olde 'woman called Mistres Boner, mother to Doctour Boner, 'sometime Bishop of London; which I thought good to 'touch, as well for the rare clemency of Doctour Ridley, as 'the vnworthy immanity and vngratefull disposition againe 'of Doctor Boner. Bishop Ridley being at his manor of

'Fulham, alwayes sent for the sayd Mistres Boner, dwelling 'in an house adioyning to his house, to dinner and supper, 'with one Mistres Mungey Boners sister, saying: go for 'my mother Boner, who comming, was euer placed in the 'chayre at the tables end, being so gently intreated, wel-'commed, and taken, as though he had been borne of her 'owne body, being neuer displaced of her seate, althoughe 'the Kings Counsell had been present, saying, when any of 'them were there (as diuers times they were) by your Lord-'ship's fauor, this place of right and custome is for my 'mother Boner[8]." That Mrs. Boner and her daughter were respectable we may perhaps be permitted to hope, for the sake of Bishop Ridley. At all events, there seems to have been no disavowal or concealment of parentage on the part of his predecessor.

After having told this story, Strype, who is generally prepared to re-echo the sentiments of Fox, cries out in horror, "But to see the base ingratitude of Boner; when 'he was restored again in Queen Marys reign, he used 'Ridley far otherwise than Ridley used him: for he would 'not allow the leases which Ridley had made, which was in 'danger to redound to the utter ruin of many poor men. 'He had a sister with three children, whom he married to 'one Shipside a servant of his, and provided for them. 'This sister Boner turned out of all, and endeavoured the 'destruction of Shipside, had not Bishop Hethe delivered 'him[9]." That is, the reader must observe, "Teste Georg. Shipsido," as Fox writes his authority; and it may be well believed that George Shypside was not so good a witness in his own cause, as he was respecting his mother Boner's civil entertainment. He might naturally be sore at the up-setting of a comfortable, and perhaps not discreditable, little piece of nepotism. I dare say, however, that it never once crossed the mind of good Mr. Strype, that while the mother was thus ostentatiously patronized, the son, whose deprivation had called for this charitable dole on her behalf, was lying in gaol. But the strangest thing is, that *after* having given this story, Strype should have been so far carried away by the torrent of base and filthy invective, as to tell his readers "Boner, bishop of London, was a bastard

[8] Ed. 1596, p. 1559.

[9] Cranm. vol. i. p. 298.

'all over. He a bastard, his father a bastard, his grand-'father a notorious whoremaster. For this was his pedigree, 'as I find it set down in a collection of old MSS.,"[1] &c. We are certainly much indebted to Strype for publishing many manuscripts which he found in old collections, but we must receive what he says of them, and from them, with a constant recollection that, in his estimation, one old manuscript appears to have been about as good as another. To return, however, to the Articles.

"¶ The xv article.

"Item whether they, and eueriche of them, to the best of their powers at all tymes have exhorted & stirred the people to quietnesse and concorde, and to the obedyence of the Kyng and Quenes maiesties and their officers, rebuking all sedicion and tumult with all unlawful assemblies, mouing the people to charity and good order, and charging the fathers and mothers, masters and governors of youthe, to kepe good rule, and to instruct them in vertue & goodnesse, to the honor of God and of this realme, and to haue them occupied in some honest art and occupacion, to gette their living thereby."—f. 52. b.

In the course of the "Declaration" of this Article, Bale says:—

"To instruct them (ye saye) in vertue and goodnesse. Whie than haue ye forbidden them Christes Testament, and all other scriptures both in English and Latine, as in your seuenth articles folowinge concerninge scholemaisters? Are there any bokes els in the worlde, that can shewe more vertue and goodnesse than they? I thinke verylye, that there are not greater Deuils, than you be, neyther yet more manifest adversaryes to the truthe of God. All this (ye saye) ye woulde haue done to the honour of God and welthe of this realme, I think ye woulde saye. For if you aduysedly doo couple God and this realme in one honour (as your wryting expresseth) I thincke you more than mad. But what honor can God have at any mans hand, ether yet what health this realm, wythout the knowledge and obedience of his word? I would gladly have this question answeared, which neuer will be done by you, that haue with so expresse wordes condempned the reading thereof. Be ashamed of thy blasphemouse doinges thou most beastlye bellye God and dampnable donge hill, with thy Golden pyllowes afore thee. And take hede least thou drop to the bottom of hell with Chore, Dathan, and Abiron, for this presumpcion and horrible contempt."—f. 55. b.

The xviii Article.

"Item whether they or any of them, sens the Quenes maiesties proclamacion, hath or doth vse to saye or synge the diuine seruice,

[1] Mem. III. i. 172, published many years after his Cranmer.

minister the sacramentes or sacramentals, or other thinges in English, contrarie to the ordre of this realme."—f. 63.

Part of the Declaration is;—

"These terrible termagants of antichrist, such as is this beastli & vnlearned bastard Bonner, wil suffer in the churches of England, no service to be done, neither yet the necessary sacraments of Baptisme and the Lordes Supper, to be ministred in English," &c.—f. 64. b.

The xix Article.

"Item, whether they or any of them, in theyr suffrages, collectes, and prayers, doeth vse to praye for the Kinge and Quenes maieste by the names of King Philipp and Quene Marye according to a letter and commaundement therin lawfully gyuen nowe of late vnto them by their ordinary."—f. 66.

℄ The Declaration.

"See I pray you, how arrogaunt this porkishe papist is here. So like is he in condicions to his father of Rome, as the yong wolfe is like to the olde. Here must his underwolfes, or curates as he calleth them, have suffrages," &c.—*Ibid.*

In the course of the xx Article, the Bishop enquired,

"Whether anye person have refused or contempned to . . . . be confessed and receiue at the priestes hand the benefite of absolucion, according to the laudable custom of this realme."—f. 70.

On this Bale says,

"Thus have we of the Scriptures, that the benefyte of remyssion, commeth immediatlye from God and hys Christ, but no mention have we of the hand of a papyst. I would wonder at it, that thys Bonner a greate doctoure of both lawes, sometime a kinges Embassadour, and now a bishop, should appeare by his owne wrytinges, so beastly a bussarde, and a fole so blockishly ignoraunt. But that I finde it also wrytten that the wisedome of this worlde, is a stark folishnesse afore God."—f. 75.

Then, after admitting that "Gods lawe is to be sought at the mouth of the priest," he goes on to say;—

"But that we should fetch absolucion at his baudy handes, it is yet the mooste doltish doggerel that ever I hard. That diuinity myght have come from Jane bold the Queenes foole among all her cuppes. But what doctrine bryngeth Bonner to the establishment of this howsel, confession, & absolucion? The laudable custome of this realme. That is the Bible which he hath studied, nexte vnto the beere potte."—f. 75. b.

In the course of his "Declaration" of the xxiv Article, Bale has this passage;—

"In their idle doynges they are men spiritual. Though they have halfe a score of sonnes and doughters abrode, if it be out of

marryage, there is no chastitye broken. The holy order of priesthode standeth still undefyled, for the character thereof is undeleble, and the hot yron marke unremoueable. Take glorious Gardiner, blowe bolle Bonner, tottering Tunstal, wagtaile Weston, and carted Chicken, and all the other fine Rochet men of Englande. For all the notable whoredomes which they have don they are styll holye pastours, and horrible [*sic.* I suppose facetiously for honourable] spiritual men."—f. 90. b.

The xxiv Article begins;—

"¶ Item, whether the person or vicar doth repair and maintain his chauncel and mansion house in sufficient reparation," &c.

In the course of his "Declaration," Bale says, with reference to this;—

"Well, these chauncels muste now be repayred, master 'Bonner saith, that their may ones again leade al to the 'deuil with their blind latin patterings and wawlings. 'Wheras one crieth like a pig,"—but the rest of this ribaldry may be found in Strype, who says parenthetically, and almost pathetically, "(I use the words of John Bale, who would call a spade a spade.)" Poor dear Bale, that way of his sometimes made his best friends more than half ashamed of him, but he *would* do it, and even Strype, who considered him "an author of high esteem," was constrained to acknowledge that "he is sometimes blamed, and blameworthy indeed, for his rude and plain language [2]." But to proceed—in the course of his declaration of Article xxvi, after having stated that the tonsure was brought into the church by Pope Martin, Bale goes on to say;—

"It is not than much to be marueled, if this other monster Bonner after the last preaching of Christes gospell hath brought it into the Englishe churche agayn, with other supersticions more. For that wylde brockishe bore in breakynge vppe Gods vyneyarde there, Psal. 79. hadde rather haue that swyll and drosse of Antichrist, than the most precyous delycates of the holye scriptures," &c.—f. 99. b.

On part of Article xxix,

"To quarell at this presente, this beastly fole parauenture would bring in the professed preasthode of his sodamitycall maister. But I wyll that he knowe it, that the pedlarye preasthode of that popet, shall in perfection be neuer lyke that holy presthode, which all we so many as beleue & are baptysed haue in Christ Jesu, as S. Peter declareth, 1 Pet. ii. and also S. John in his Reuelation . i . and . v." —f. 112. b.

[2] Mem. III. i. 177, 178.

And on the same Article;—

"The actes of so noble a prince as King Edwarde the .vi. was this shamlesse bastarde, more vile in those doyngs than any kytchen slaue, contemptuouslye calleth inuocations [*read* innouations] meaninge newe lawes or alterations of the worst sort."—f. 113.

Again, in the same Article;—

"Such reuerence had King Dauid to the function and offyce of a kinge, for that it was an authority geuen of God, that he wold lay no violent handes vppon Saule, being his mortall ennemye, and not Goddes frende nether at that tyme .i. Regum. xxiiii. And yet this fylthy swineheard abasheth not obprobriously to reuile his naturall king, to inuert his most godly actes at his pleasure and also mooste arrogantly to boast of it. And what is thy idolatrous mas and lowsye Latine seruice, thou sosbelly swilbol, but the very draf of Antichrist and dregges of the deuil?"—f. 113. b.

Bonner having, in his xxxiv Article, spoken of "the seuen deadelye synnes with their ofspringe, progenye and yssue," Bale, in the course of his "Declaration," says,

"I wondre therfore to fynde Bonner such a beastly fole, that he knoweth no more but .vii. deadly synnes," &c.—*Sig.* T. iii. b.

The xxxvi Article is,

"Item whether stipendary prests do behaue themselves discretlye and honestlye in all poynts towardes their parson or vicar, geuing an othe, and doinge according to the law and ecclesiasticall constitucions, ordinaunces, and laudable customes in that behalf."—*Sig.* V. i.

¶ The Declaration.

"That Christ discommendeth and rebuketh in his chosen churche, Joh. x. this bussard this beast, and this bluddering papiste doth allow, preferre, and place, in his newli errected synagoge of the Deuil. And stipendarye preast is he which serveth for lucre and bely chere, and not for anye spirituall profitte towards the christen congregacion. And such a one Christ calleth a mercenarye or carelesse hyrelinge, which in beholdinge the cruell wolfe to come vpon the flocke, yea, to scatter them and deuour theym, he regardethe it nothinge at all? Suche rybaldes and brothels hath Bonner taken into the sheepe foulde, as like to lyke, withoute all godly and christen respecte. But wyl ye knowe the cause whye? Whan he was in the marshallsea, they broughte him in chese, butter, and bacon for the fyrst course, and for the latter, pigs, gese, and fat capons. Is not that (think you) honestye, vertue and learninge ynough for a christen minister in the diocese of London?"—*Sig.* V. i. b.

Whatever opinion the reader may form from the foregoing extracts, I think he will allow that I have given him full ground for forming one, and will acquit me of having

made Bale an offender for a word; especially if he knows anything of the passages which I have passed over in taking specimens from this one little work. "Bale's pen, indeed," says the apologetic Strype, "was sharp and foul 'enough sometimes, when he had such foul subjects to deal 'with, as the cruelties and uncleannesses of many of the 'popish priests, and prelates and cloisterers."[3] But he had no such "foul subjects" to deal with in Bonner's Articles, which were quiet, temperate, business-like affairs—chiefly what might be called official matters, couched in official language. The plain fact is, that Bale's pen was foul simply because he was foul himself; and he had foul subjects to deal with because they were the subjects with which he delighted to deal; as is shown in a very marked way by his bringing into a matter like this a profusion of foul matter, such as I have not ventured to quote.

Strype has given the Articles at full length[4], and I think it will be hard to find in them anything to justify the "sharp and foul" attack of Bale. On the other hand, it is amusing to see how very sensitive Strype is, when a hard word had been uttered against those who are the subjects of his eulogy. In his life of Cranmer, though he condescends to reply to some of "the unjust calumnies some hot spirited papists have cast upon his memory," yet there are others whom he considers too bad to merit that honour. "I shall pass over," he says with unmoved dignity, "the unhand-'some name that Feckenham gave him, calling him *Dolt*. . . . I shall also pass by what Bishop Boner then said of him, '*viz.* that he dared to say, that Cranmer would recant so 'he might have his living; as though he were a man of a 'prostituted conscience, and would do anything upon 'worldly considerations."[5] Imagine Bonner saying such a thing of Cranmer. What did Bale ever say of Bonner, that equalled that? or that was so bad as Bonner's "rude way of misnaming such as came before him," so that on one occasion he actually called a tailor pricklouse?"[6]

Perhaps enough has been said to give the reader an opportunity of judging of Bale's style, and of the spirit in which he wrote; but still there are two points which

[3] Mem. II. i. 56.
[4] Mem. III. ii. 217.
[5] Cranm. ii. 659.
[6] Strype, Mem. III. ii. 63.

should be stated, in order to his forming a just estimate of the matter,

In the first place, there is to us something so revolting in the very idea of men being put to death for their belief, even if we suppose it to be heretical, that we are disposed to sympathize in the indignation of those who saw it as the real case of others, and had good reason to apprehend that it might actually be their own. But it must be remembered, that when Bale wrote this book, little that could be called persecution had taken place. Not one martyr had suffered. The mere date (if not a forgery) proves that if this fierce ribaldry was not in some degree a cause, it could not certainly be an effect, of most of those scenes of cruelty in the reign of Mary, with which Fox's Martyrology has rendered us familiar.

Again, whatever ideas of toleration we may have, Bale had none such. He did not, indeed, like to be persecuted himself, or to have his party persecuted; but as to persecution itself, and what we should think cruelty, he was not squeamish. He thought that it would have been a good thing if there had been a general slaughter of the massmongering priests, and he made no secret of his opinion. He even took the liberty to hint to his sovereign that he had been remiss on this point, and that something of the kind was still expected from him.

"Such time as our most worthy souurain Kynge Henry the .viii now lyuing after *the most Godly example of Kynge Josyas* visited the temples of his reame, he perseyued the Sinneful shryne of this Becket to be unto his people a moost perniciouse evell, and therefore in the word of the lord he vtterly among other destroyed it. If he had upon that and such other abhominable shrines brent those Idolatrous pryestes which were (and are yet) theyr chefe mainteiners, he had *fulfilled y^e^ godly history throughout.* But y^t^ which was not than perfourmed in hope of their amendement, may by chance lyght vppon them hereafter whan no Gentell warning will seme to be regarded. I dout not at all but his noble discretion perceyueth much more in that wicked generation of the pope's norryshing vp, which alwayes hath mainteined (and yet doth) such manifest errours, than he ever in his life yet uttered."—*Life of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham*, p. 53. b.

Bale was, however, disappointed as to King Henry; and all he could do was to offer the same suggestion to his son and successor, and try whether the youthful Edward might not be tutored into a Josias, who would

persevere and fulfil "the godly history *throughout*." In his Epistle Dedicatory, prefixed to "The Laboryouse Journey" of "Iohan Leylande," addressed to the young monarch, he says;—

"We fynde Exodi . i. that the mighty magistrate vndre God Moyses, among his other most worthy actes, droue the deuouryng locustes, which had in Egypte destroyed al that was greene vpon the earth, into the reade sea, and there drowned them so that they were no more sene. The like wrought your highnesses most noble father of excellent memory Kynge Henry the .viij. though it were in an other kinde, suche time as he dyscharged this his realme of Antichristes noyful cattel, Monkes, Chanons, Frires, Nonnes, Heremites, Perdoners, and soule syngers, with other execrable sectes of perdicion. Neuerthelesse our Egypcyanes both of the clergye, and layte, haue soughte euer sens, and yet seketh to this daye, to leade your Maiesties people in a palpable kynde of darkenesse by their masses, and other sorcerouse witchcraftes; as lately apered in the last commocyon of Cornewale and Deuenshyre, to reduce them agayne to the *old* obedyence of the great Pharao of Rome, in the stynkyng kyngdome of ydolatry. But your noble counsell, to withstande thys vyolence, hath hytherto moste worthelye wrought, in the myghtie worde of the Lorde, and in the stronge power of your regall rodde, to dryue this horryble plage of darkenesse from the face of thys earthe, and our good hope is, that they wyl gracyously so styll continue.

"Salomon is commended of Jesus the sonne of Syrach, Eccle. xlvij. for that the Lorde had hym replenyshed wyth all wysdome, and for hys sake had dryuen the enemyes awaye farre of, that he myghte buylde an howse in hys name, and prepare vnto hym a sanctuary for euer, whych al to this daye we behold in youre kyngelye persone fulfylled, prayeng vnto God that it may so styl endure. As in your pryncelye begynnynges ye apere vnto vs *a very Josias* both in your tendre youthe and vertuouse educacyon, so our specyal hope is, that in your dayly procedinges, ye wyl *styl perseuer the same.*"—*Sign.* A. v.

To return, however, to Bale's Declaration—there is another point which is worthy of notice, with a view to our present inquiry. The book professes (and I presume truly) to have been written "in the yeare of our Lord a. 1554. By John Bale," who dates the preface "¶ Wrytten from Basile in Heluetia. An. 1554." I have already said that I do not know whether it came over into this country in print or in manuscript, and, in fact, I do not know whether there is any edition which purports to have been printed at that time at Basil or anywhere else. What I wish the reader to observe, however, is, that the copy before me is of an edition "¶ newlye set fourth and

'allowed, according to the order appointed in the Quenes 'Maiesties Iniunctions," and "Imprynted at London by 'Jhon Tysdall, for Frauncys Coldocke dwellinge in Lom-'bard strete, ouer agaynste the Cardinalles hatte, and are 'there to be sold at his shoppe 1561."—that is in the days of Elizabethan safety and triumph, while the ex-bishop of Ossory was contenting himself with his stall at Canterbury, and the ex-bishop of London was in gaol, "mercifully, I may say, laid in there, to defend him from the rage of the people."[7] Nobody will dispute that there might be some mercy in putting the aged prelate even in a gaol as a place of safety, if "the rage of the people" was to be cultivated by the republication of such virulent invective; but what was the object of reprinting it at such a time? By whom, and with what view, was it done? Supposing it only a permitted speculation by the booksellers, whom did they expect to make it worth their while? These are points worth inquiring about; but they must be passed by for the present while I bring forward the other two writers to whom I have alluded.

ESSAY IV.

PURITAN STYLE. No. II.

PONET—TRAHERON.

THE writer of whom I come now to speak is described by Strype as "a man of great parts and acquired learning"[1]—"a very ingenious as well as a learned man"[2]—in fact, as "one of the best and eminentest sort of divines."[3] Whether he was of St. John's College in Cambridge, as Strype says in one place,[4] or of Queens' College, as he tells us in another,[5] is of little consequence, though I believe the latter is the truth; at any rate, he was, according to the same authority, "one of those many brave shoots that the university of

[7] Strype, Grindal, p. 150.
[2] Cran. ii. 607.
[4] Cran. i. 403.
[1] Cran. i. 403.
[3] Cheke, 95.
[5] Smith, 13.

Cambridge then produced,"[6] and "one of the greatest ornaments of learning then in Cambridge."[7]

There seem to have been some among his contemporaries whose opinion resembled this, for when Bishop Gardiner was deprived of the see of Winchester, Dr. John Ponet, who was then Bishop of Rochester, and who had previously been chaplain to King Henry VIII., and to Archbishop Cranmer, was selected to fill the vacant see. He held it until the accession of Queen Mary, when he fled beyond sea, and became one of that body of exiles whose proceedings form the subject of our present inquiry.

First of all, however, (and, for the present, exclusively,) we are concerned with his style as a writer, and perhaps I cannot illustrate this better than by quoting his description of his predecessor in the see of Winchester. It is incidentally brought into his account of Sir William Paget, and is as follows:—

"And how at leinght was P[aget] the maister of practices handled, that will haue one parte in euery pagent, if he maye by prayeng or paieng put in his foote? But before I procede to speake of this maister of practices it shall not be amysse, that I tell you somwhat of his maister, the doctour of practices. For albeit this doctour be now (but to late) throughly knowen, yet it shall be requisite, that our posteritie knowe what he was, and by his description see, how nature had shaped the outwarde partes, to declare what was within. This doctour hade a swart colour, an hanging loke, frowning browes, eies an ynche within the head, a nose hooked like a bussarde, wyde nosetrilles like a horse, euer snuffing in to the wynde, a sparowe mouthe, great pawes like the deuil, talauntes on his fete like a grype, two ynches longer than the naturall toes, and so tyed to with sinowes, that he coulde not abyde to be touched, nor scarce suffre them to touche the stones.

And nature hauing thus shaped the forme of an outwarde monstre, it gaue him a vengeable witte, which at Cambridge by labour and diligence he hade made a great deale worse, and brought vp many in that facultie: Wriothesley, Germayne Gardiner (whom he caused spedily to be hanged, least he should haue to muche disclosed his maisters arte) and among many other this maister or proctour of practices, whom we are now entred to speake of.

This doctour to geue some signification of his nature and conning to come alofte, that he might doo the more mischief, betrayeth his M. Carnall Wolsei[8]; and more than any other laboureth the diuorse

[6] Smith, 159. [7] Cheke, 18.

[8] This sort of wit is very characteristic of the school of writers with which we are concerned, and to which Bishop Ponet belonged. He had before (*Sig.* G. iii.) said "as *Carnal Phoole* truly citeth," &c. The

betwene king Henry and the dowager. And by and by he earnestly sought to haue ridden in the kinges bootes: worse could not content him. But whan he sawe that wold not be, and considred it better to haue stoare than one only paire (for so perchaunce he might haue founde them somtymes not all cleane whan he wolde haue vsed them, and also it should be a let to bring to passe that he purposed) he changeth his purpose: and bycause none shoulde remembre his practices before, nor suspecte the rest to come, he shaueth his crowne as broade as a sawcer, and decketh him self with a white smocke like a portour of the Stiliarde. But what nedeth suche circumlocucion, whan euery body knoweth this doctour of practices was called D. Stephan Gardiner? After this, his lucke was to be committed to the towre, whan Tyburne hade ben a place more worthy his desertes."[9]—*Sig.* I. iii. *b.*

Another passage relating to Bishop Gardiner is as follows. Speaking of the debasement of the coin he says:—

"Which thing the great deuil and cutthrote of England (the papistes God) in his sermon that he made at Paules Crosse, upon this theme (now is the tyme to wake from slepe, my brethren, for now is our ioie and pompe more nye, than whan we before dissembled to beleue in Christ. Be of good cheare, my disciples, our trouble is past, our ioye is at hande) letted not to blustre out. In this sermon to bring the dead innocent and blessed King Edwarde (whom for his vertue he hated) in hatred of the people: for he imputed to him (a childe and a warde) the lewde and wicked behaveour of his cruell counsailours, &c. . . . . the same deuil Gardyner was the chief counsaillour to have the money abased, to maintain the same. And now lately (whan he hath broken his chayne) devised Rosemary pence," &c.—*Sig.* F. ij. *b.*.

It is impossible to quote the passage without directing the attention of the reader to the irreverent burlesque of Scripture which it contains, and which was too common, and too characteristic among the writers with whom we are now engaged. As to the exiled prelate's power of invective, however, it is a very inadequate specimen. A much better may be found in his attack on Bishop Bonner. Let the reader imagine the ex-Bishop of Winchester from his

reader is probably aware that the name of the Cardinal, now commonly called Pole, was then generally pronounced as if spelt (and frequently was spelt) *Pool*, or *Poole*.

[9] It is strange to find Strype quoting this description of Bishop Gardiner, and telling us that Bishop Ponét "left a character of him, concealing the bishop's name under the periphrasis of *the doctor of practices*," (M. III. i. 450,) while the expression of his name occurs so immediately after the description (as the reader may see by this extract) and is, in the original book, rendered peculiarly conspicuous by being the only two words of roman type in the middle of the page of italic.

place of safety (which he had reached, not as a persecuted heretic, but as a run-away traitor) breaking out in such terms on the Bishop of London—on one whom, independent of all respect due to office, it might have been thought right and wise to conciliate, and whom, to say the least, it could not be christian, or humane, or politic, to exasperate ;—

"Were not the ymages and Roodeloftes in Englande destroied by autoritie of ciuile power? And dothe not Boner the Archbocher of London for all that force them that obeied the authoritie (bicause he saieth, it was not lauful) to make them vp again at their owne charges? But Boner, thou that allowest nothing to be well done (by what soeuer autoritie it be done) except it be laufull, nor nothing to be laufull that is not agreing to thy canon lawes: I haue to saie to thee. Stande stil a while, whilest I rubbe the. Tell me plainly, and face not out a lie, as thou arte wont: speake not one thing, and thinke an other, as thy nature is: ones in thy life tell the truthe, and shame thy maister the deuil. If thou were the sonne of the earthe by thy fathers side, and of an erraunt hoore by the mother, and so a bastarde: by what autoritie saiest thou thy masse, whan thy lawes suffre no bastardes to be priestes without dispensacion? how comest thou to be a bishop, whan thy lawes saie, thou maiest be no priest? How be thy iudgements laufull, whan thou by thy canones maiest be no iudge? All men knowe, that thy mother whan thou wast begoten, was an hoore.

The common voice and fame saieth, and the truthe is, that albeit one Boner (a bare whippe Iacke) for lucre of money toke vpon him to be thy father, and than to mary thy mother, yet thou wast persone Sauages bastarde: and of that race come thy cousins Wimmeslowe thy Archediacon of London (a mete eie for suche a grosse head) and Wimslowe his brother, and a great meany moo notable. These thinges be so euident and plaine, that thou cannest not (without blushing) denie them: neither thou wilt (I knowe) denie them. For thou boastest and braggest muche, that thou comest of gentil blood.

But thou wilt saye, thou hast a bull of dispensacion from the pope, I require to knowe, what time it was graunted. Thou saiest, whan thou wast at Rome. It is euen that I requiered. Thou wast indede at Rome, proctour for the princes dowager the Quenes mother, in the cause of diuorce betwene King Henry the viii. and her.

Whan thou sawest that no prebendes, no Archediaconries, no bishoprikes were to be goten by continuing on her parte, thou betraidest her cause, and becamest of counsail with the King. O noble counsaillour. O seuere and lawful iudge.

A mete man to sit in condemnacion of so many innocentes: yea more mete to stande on the pillarie, than in a pulpit: to be tied vp in a boare franke, than walke in a princes chambre: to weare a Tiburne tippet, than a graie amise."—*Sig.* D. vii. *b.*

One can understand, after reading such a passage as this, how it came that Bishop Ponet entertained John Bale as his chaplain. Perhaps their knowledge and estimation of each other's ability might enable them at times to speak civilly to each other. To the exiled bishop, however, it seemed all too little; he has not done with the object of his wrath, and he presently returns to the charge;—

"But Boner, I maye not leaue thee thus; Geue me leaue (Sauage Boner) to dispute this mater of laufull and not laufull, a litle more with thee. If thou and the rest of the traitours thy Companiones should persuade the frendeles Quene of England (whom ye haue enchaunted) to geue ouer the towne of Calese and Barwike to a straunge prince, and (contrary to her othe not to diminishe any parte of the rightest of the Crowne and liberties of the people, which kinges of England at their Coronacion in tymes past made, and which she also made to her subiectes, whan she was crowned before she was a perfit Quene) she folowed your counsail, som noble personage sent thider to deliuer the keyes, and the deputie and garison did not strike of the messagiers head, and set it on the gates, but obeyed it, and not resisted it: wer not thou and thi felowes traitours for persuading her so doo? hade not she broken her othe and promyse? were not that-tournay a traitour for doing that he was commaunded? were not the deputie and garison traitours for suffring it to be done? Answer. What cannest thou saie for thy self and thy folowes? [*sic*] Giltie, or not giltie? Thou standest mewet, what not a worde? Thou art sure, your good will, will stande you in as good stede, as the dede done. Neither doo ye passe, though the crowes be fedde with your carion carcases, and the deuil with your soules, so ye maye leaue behinde you a fame, that by your traytourie, the laitie of England was destroyed, and the spiritualtie restored to their pompe and lordly power.

But before the halter stoppe thy winde, Boner, let vs knowe, what thou canst saye for her. Sayest thou, princes be not bounden by their othes and promisses?" &c.—*Sig.* E. ii.

These extracts are perhaps sufficient to give the reader some idea of Bishop Ponet's style, and to lead him to suspect that where these passages are to be found, he may find more and worse.

Let us, therefore, proceed to the third writer, of whom I have to speak on this occasion—that is, BARTHOLOMEW TRAHERON, whom Strype introduces as "a learned man, and well studied in the divinity of the gospel,"[1] and who was, according to Anthony à Wood, "a compleat person and much respected by scholars."[2] He was brought up in

[1] Mem. II. i. 420.

[2] Ath. i. 324, ed. Bliss.

the university of Oxford by Master Richard Tracy, whom Strype supposes to have been the son of the Tracy whose remains were burned[3]. He was among those who were detected with John Frith at Oxford in the year 1527 or 1528[4]. He afterwards succeeded Roger Ascham in the office of librarian to King Edward VI., was made Dean of Chichester[5], and named in a commission for the correction of ecclesiastical laws[6]. It does not appear why his name and some others were soon withdrawn from this commission[7]; but in a short time after he obtained a prebend at Windsor.

On the accession of Queen Mary, he fled beyond sea; and the leading part which he took among the exiles is thus stated by Strype: "After the separation of a part of the 'congregation at Frankford, which departed and settled, 'some at Basil, and some at Geneva, those that remained, 'who were for the observation of the English book used 'under King Edward, began to set up an university there 'for the maintenance of learning: wherein the readers 'constituted were, Dr. Horn, late Dean of Durham, for 'Hebrew; Dr. Mullins for Greek; and Dr. Bartholomew 'Traherne or Traheron, late Dean of Chichester, for the 'divinity lecture."

He further tells us that Traheron, "among his other 'readings, read upon the beginning of St. John's Gospel, 'designedly against the Arians, who began much to increase 'in these times (especially among Protestants), and upon 'the fourth chapter of the Revelations, which led him to 'treat of the providence of God. The reason he chose to 'read upon this subject was, to comfort himself and others 'by the consideration of the Divine Providence in their 'present afflicted condition. But a certain learned person, 'who had been his auditor, impugned some part of what he 'had spoken, urging that he had used irreverend speech, in 'saying, that it was in God's will and ordinance that 'Adam should sin, making God the author of sin."[8]

Strype gives some further account of the dissension and

[3] Mem. II. i. 421.
[4] Mem. I. i. 581.
[5] Mem. II. ii. 266, 267.
[6] See Strype, Mem. II. i. 530, and II. ii. 205, 206.
[7] Strype, ibid., and see Gran. I. 388.
[8] Mem. III. i. 543.

of a lecture which Traheron read in defence of his opinion, but he says nothing of a tract which he published, and which must, I presume, relate to the same matter. It is, at all events, directed against one of his "co-mates in exile," who had disagréed with him on the same, or a very similar, point of doctrine; and as our only object at present is to gain some idea of the style and spirit of the author, it is sufficient for our purpose. At the same time we are doing him rather more than justice by quoting a work written under such circumstances and on such an occasion, rather than an invective against those by whom he had been "chased out" of his country. The title-page gives the key note of the composition; and it would be hardly doing it justice to copy it without an attempt at something a little like a fac-simile.

AN AVNS-
VVERE MADE BY BAR. TRA
HERON TO A PRIVIE PAPISTE
vvhich crepte in to the english
congregation of christian
exiles vndre the vi-
sor of a fauo-
rer of the
gospel,

but at length bewraied him selfe to be one of the popes asses, thorough his slouche ea res, and than became a laughing stoc ke to al the companie, whom he had amazed before with his maske

¶ Hereunto is added the subscription of the chiefest of the companie first, and afterward the subscriptiō of M. Ro. Watson alone, in special wordes, bicause he was cōpted the best learned amonge the reste, & therefore his iudgement was most regarded and required.

¶ Imprinted Anno. 1558.

This is immediately followed by an address "To Master Gilbert Barckley," (who was a fellow exile, and afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells,) which begins thus:—

"I heard with great griefe of mind, how a counterfaite papiste labored shamelesly to deface your most honest, and godlie behauior towardes him, with the foule name of simuled frenship and flatterie. And I know the tendernes of your herte, and how much it euer iustly grieueth you, that the good name, that god hath giuen you, should be blemished with false reportes, and impudent lies. But I trust your wisedom is such, that you wil not be longe trobled, with the barckinges of so foule a mouthed mastife. Wherefore I exhorte you to staie youselfe against this open iniurie vpon the ground of an honest vpright conscience, whereof sondrie, that be here present, and haue longe time knowen you, giue vndoubted testimonies, and haue seen most certaine frutes. This mastife, whose name I wil not uttre, though it signifie that he came of a wilie generation, hath opened his mouth against me also, and hath enforced himselfe to scratch, and teare me with his nails. But god of his goodness, hath giuen me alwaies, wherewith to defende myselfe. The defence that he hath now ministred vnto me, against this three-headed Cerberus, bred and long fed in the popes kennel, I dedicate to you my dear frend master Barckley," &c.

After this letter follows a statement of the matter in dispute relative to a passage of Augustine. It is all in a single page, which contains, in addition, the following title:—

¶ TO THIS HERE FOLOVVETH
MASTER MASKERS REPLICATION

This replication does not occupy a page and a half, and considering the sort of matter with which we are at present engaged, it is perfectly temperate; the only sentence which could be considered offensive being this:—"If you yet 'undrestand not .S. Aug. to be manifestly against you, than 'I counsel you, go to a logician, and aske of him and he 'will tell you, that your assertion, which is, that it was the 'wil of god, that Adam should sin, and S. Augustines cen-'sure, which is, that man, whan he sinned, did not that god 'wold, be *opposita contraria*, which strive so sore, that thei 'can not stand to gether, but the one overthroweth the 'other." One would have thought that this, which is really the worst, might have been received with calmness; but, says Master Traheron, placing the title in the middle of the page in manner following—

¶ HERE VPON I SENT HIM THIS LETTRE.

After bringing forward various passages from Augustine he thus proceeds;—

"I cold allege innumerable such places, but that it is pitie, to combre so slendre a doctor, with to manie places at once. If you had ben as much occupied in reading .S. Au. as you haue ben occupied in dreaming vain victories to your selfe, in doting after glorie, and in making your selfe droncken, whith the swetenes thereof, you shuld haue knowen, that this is a principal proposition in .S. Aug. which to proue, he driueth his argumentes. But you haue spent so much time in kissing your faire daughter vaine glorie, that you haue had no leasure, to know what Saint Aug. goeth aboute. Surely master .N. if you were not to be pitied bicause of your madnes, you were wel to be laughed at, bicause of your fondnes. But I thincke it rather my duetie, to lament your most miserable state. But this I wil saie, that if you amend not your maners in time, you shal giue me occasion, to bewraie your longe eares.

And than though you have longe walked *tanquã leo cumanus*, it wilbe knowen what you be in dede. I wold be lothe to make a farther anatomie of your foule inwarde partes, but if I shal perceaue, that it shalbe to your welth, I wil not sticke to giue you a launch, or two. I haue hitherto handled you a great deale more honestly, than you deserue, for such respectes, as god knoweth, and I haue labored to couer manie an il fauored spotte, but if you go forth in your wickednes, I wil strippe you starke naked, and shew your scabbes to the world. God almightie vouchsafe to driue out that perte spirite that combreth you. Amen."—*Sig.* A. iiii. *b.*

Master Traheron does not think fit to let us see the answer which he received to this letter, but he gives us the following account of it:—

"¶ To this lettre master Masker aunswered first, that he wold differ the aunswere to these places of .S. Aug. vntil I had aunswered his former interpretation vpon .S. Au. Secondly that I fal to to raging, and that I can not iustly charge him with fondnes and madnes. Thirdly he coniureth me to shew him his scabbes of iniquitee, if I know anie in him, &c. Whereunto here foloweth my aunswere."

Our business is obviously with the latter of these divisions; on which Master Traheron says:—

"You saie that I fal to raging. But you shal finde in the ende, that it was a good honest zele vttered only to amende your outragious faultes. You ar angrie that I charge you with madnes, and fondnes, for you cã not see them, in your propre person. But if you

cal to remembrance your whole behauior in this only matter, that of late you haue enterprised amonge vs, you shal find more madnes, and fondnes, than can be expressed. And though you perchaūce can not find it, bicause you be blinded with selfe loue, yet al other mē haue marked it, more than maketh for your honestie. You ar not ashamed to saie, that you offred a writing for reconciliation, which in dede containeth nothing but shameles vaunting of your selfe, defacing of other far honester than you, railinges, malitious slaunders, and open lies. And yet you can not see, wherein you haue broken charitee. Was not that verie charitably don of you, so gredely, and so malitiously to desire, that M. Rose might be punished, a man that hath trauailed so long, so painfully, and so frutefully in the ministerie of goddes worde, only bicause he rubbed your gauled backe, in telling you the truthe? Was not that verie charitably don of you, to defame that right godlie sobre man, master Barckley, with most despiteful, and shameles lies? Was that verie charitably don of you to accuse, and cōdemne the hole cōpanie of hypocrital praiyng to god, besides your selfe, the greatest hypocrite of al? Was not that verie charitably don of you to vtter such a masse of poison against good men, whan you shuld have prepared your selfe to have receaued the holie communion with them, if you had not ben a secrete papiste, & an vngodlie man. Wo worth such charitee as might haue staied so godlie a purpose, if god had not wrought more strongly for vertue, thā the diuel cold worcke mischeuously for vice. But now bicause you coniure me, to shew what scabbes of iniquitie I know in you, I wil discharge my conscience. First I saie that you ar a visored, and disguised papist, as you have plainly enough discouered your selfe. Secondly I saie, that I see in you a proud, arrogant, contentious, vnquiet, and enuious spirite, which I praie god most hertely, to chase out of you, that we maie embrace you againe as a brother, whō now we have iust cause to abhorre, as a man voide of goddes feare, and stuffed with manie horrible vices, besides your subtil secrete papistrie. This vncleane spirite that I speake of, and know to be in you, is the verie cause I am sure, why you dissente from vs in this question of goddes prouidēce. For thorough goddes grace we haue not ben obscure, nor perplexed in this matter, nether can you pretende ignorance. Enuie, and the loue that stil remaineth in you to your old harlotte poperie, hath moued you to stirre these coales. Let the feare of god, and loue of truth moue you again to quench the fier that you haue kendled, or surely there shalbe a fier kendled in your herte that no man, nor time shal quenche. But I trust you wil calle to god for a better minde. And to that ende I wrote before, and now write to you agayne."

After a good deal more, which it is needless to copy, M. Traheron proceeds:—

"God giue to you and to me speedie repentance of our faultes, & opē your eyes in this matter, as he hath vouchsafed to open ours. that we maie together agree in the truthe, in

vnfained humilitee, and in christian loue, which christian loue yet hath hir sharpnes, & wil bite the faultes, that wil not other wise be amended. Wherefore at my handes you shal loke to haue your boils laũched, & to haue corrosies & smarting plaisters laied vpon them vntil theĩ be cured.

Goddes spirite directe vs.

¶ Bar. Traheron your frend assone as you can loue the truthe."

After this, in a title placed as before, M. Traheron, without giving us the reply which he received, proceeds to describe it. One would have liked better to see it, especially if it was, or could be, such a specimen of railing as he had a right to complain of :—

¶ TO THIS LETTRE OVR countrefaite protestant sent me an aunswer stuffed with an huge heape of railing wordes, wherevpon I wrote thus vn to him againe.

"If you be not sore sicke, and feoble, after so great thronges, and after your deliuerance of such a swarme of innumerable railing wordes, as it were of young diuels, you maie be matched with anie she giaunt in the world in strong, and lustie trauail, & in your faire happie childbed. It seemeth to me, that in the middest of your rauinge traunce, you had a litle witte remaining. For whereas you despeared victorie in al other thinges, you thought you wold ouer comme at the lest in railing, scoffing, and taũting. And surely you haue brought your swete purpose to passe. For I yield vnto you this noble victorie, & hold vp my handes. And bicause you haue a meruailous greedie hũger, & a thirst vnquencheable for vaine glorie, you shal haue this praise at my hãdes also, that you ar the ioliest scold, and the greatest railer, that euer I heard, or shal eare I thinke."—*Sig*, B. iii.

Enough has been extracted to show how this lecturer in divinity conducted a theological dispute with one of his own brethren, and that too, in circumstances in which it might have been supposed that there was every motive, from the highest to the lowest, for brotherly kindness and charity. How he wrote against those by whom he considered himself "chased" out of his country may be imagined, and it will

be proper to give some specimens when we come to speak of the politics held and inculcated by the party to which he belonged, and of their works viewed in connexion with the Queen and government of England. In the meantime, I will give one extract from a work which would perhaps exhibit sufficient evidence, both external and internal, of having come from his pen, even if he had not, under a thin veil of Hebrew and Greek, almost put his name to it. It is entitled, "A Warning to England to repente, and to turne 'to god from idolatrie and poperie by the terrible exemple 'of Calece, given the 7. of March. Anno. D. 1558. By 'Benthalmai Outis"; and, after quotations from Heb. xiii. and Joel ii., is added "¶ Imprinted Anno. D. 1558."; but there is no name of place or printer. Instead of any of those parts which have a more direct political bearing, and for congruity with the extracts already given from Bale and Ponet, I will give a specimen of M. Traheron's way of treating the clergy and Bishop Bonner. Addressing England, he parenthetically says:—

"Here I may not let scape the priestes of Calece, a foule broode of thy henne. Papistes they were and verie furies of hel. But if they be compared to thy prelates and preistes, they were but demipapistes and demidiuels. For he that wold discouer the foule inwarde partes of thy shauelinges and filthie smered flocke, shuld seem to rake vp the bottome of hel, yea he that wold shew the outwarde partes of them naked should shew the fowlest sight that euer was sene in the world. For what idolatrie, what pride, what covetousness, what cruetie, what lecherie, what sodomitrie was euer heard of in anie age, that thei have not far exceded? Thou canst not name a bishoppe, but thou shalt see his toungue swollen with blasphemie, his fingers dropping with the blood of innocentes, his bodie spotted with most filthie villanie, & the rest of thy AEgyptian shauelinges, striue which shal passe other farthiest in al kindes of beastlie abomination."

Then after a passage so gross that it must be omitted, he adds:—

"So manifolde, so execrable, so outrageous is their filthines, and wickednes. Who can thinke on that bloodie beast Bonner, but a most grislie, vgle & horrible monstre shal be presented before his eyes, such a one as no Polyphamus in boisteousnes, no furies of hel with their snakie heares in al pointes of mischief, no Cerberus in blasphemous roaring, no find in raging, in tearing, and in deuouring innocentes, can ouermatche. But I wil leave that botomles sea of most filthie stincking vices and passe farther."

Master Traheron passed farther to what was more directly

political; and to the opinions of himself and his companions on such subjects, I hope to direct the reader's attention in some succeeding papers. In this and the preceding, my object has been to give some specimens of the style adopted by the writers whose particular opinions I hope hereafter to exhibit and discuss. I think I shall not be charged with bringing forward for that purpose obscure and unaccredited men; and that those who have any acquaintance with the manners and literature of the period will admit that something beside the general custom of the age is required to account for what I have quoted—much more for what I have omitted.

ESSAY V.

PURITAN POLITICS. No. I.

KNOX—PONET—WYAT'S REBELLION.

IT is well enough known that on the accession of King Edward VI., it was resolved by those who were really in power, to carry on the work of Reformation (in the most comprehensive sense of that term) with a high hand; and they acted accordingly.

But it is equally certain, and it is most important to bear in mind, that all through the reign of that monarch, and especially during the latter part of it, there was a party, influential if not numerous, who not only thought that the government did not go on fast enough in the work, but felt that the people, whether attached to the old religion, or only disgusted and alarmed at the selfish rapacity of some who were forward in support of the new, did not go with them at all. I earnestly entreat the reader to consider and reflect on this fact, which is too frequently overlooked.

To say nothing of the space which it would require, it would lead us from our purpose to enter into details respecting the *causes* of this; but one *effect* I wish to bring before the notice of the reader, because it has an important bearing on the subject with which we are engaged. I mean the *agitation* (as it would now be called) which was carried on

by some of the puritan leaders, who with incessant and urgent vehemency were threatening the judgments of God upon the land. Those who are at all conversant with the writers of that period will require no proof or illustration of this; but some of them may not have reflected on it.

At all events, for the sake of others, I am tempted to give an extract from a very rare work by John Knox; who, beside his own performance in that kind, has left a remarkable testimony to the fact, in "A Godly Letter sent too the fayethfull in London, Newcastle, Barwyke, &c." and which purports to have been printed in July, 1544. The passage which I extract is described in a marginal note as a "Comparyson betwixte England and Judah *before their destruction;*" and it follows a sketch of the sin and punishment of the Israelites:—

"But before we proceade further in this matter, it shall be profytable to se how these procedinges doth agree with our estate and tyme. And firste that we had not Gods woorde offered vnto vs, will none (excepte arrant papist) alledge. We had a kynge off so godly disposition towardes vertew, and chiefly towardes Gods truthe, that none from the begynninge passed hym, and to my knowledge, none of hys yeare did euer matche hym in that behalfe, iff he might haue bene lorde of hys owne will. In this meane tyme, if synnes did abound, let euery man accuse hys owne conscience for here I am not mynded to specefie all that I knowe, neither yet is it necessarye, seynge some crymes were so manifeste and so heighnous that the earthe colde not hydde the innocent bloud, nor yet could the heauens without shame, behold the craft, the deceat, the violens and wronge, that openly was wrought. And in the meane ceason, the hande off God was busye ouer vs, and his trew messingers is kept not sylence. You know that the realme off Englande was visited with straunge plagues and whether that it was euer prophesied, that the worse plagues were to folow, I appeale to the testemony of your own conscience, but what ensewed here vpon? Alas I am ashamed to reherse it, vniuersal contempt of all godly admonitions, hatered of those that rebuked their vyces: Autoresing of suche as colde invente most vylanye agaynste the preachers of God. In this matter I maye be admitted for a sufficient witnes, for I hard and saw, I vnderstood and knew, with the sorow of my hart, the manifest contempt and the crafty deuices of the deuil against those most godly and learned preachers, that this last Lent, Anno. 1553. were apoynted to preache before the Kynges maiestie, as also against all others, whose tounges were not tempered by the holy water of the courte; too speake it plainlye, who flattering agaynste their owne conscience, coulde not saye, all was well and nothinge neded reformation.

What reuerence and audience was geuen vnto preachers, this laste Lent, by such as then were in autoritie, their owne countinaunces

declared assuredly, euen suche as was geuen to Jeremye, they hated suche, as rebuked their vyce, and stubbernlye they sayde: We will not amende, and yet howe boldely theyr synnes were rebuked, suche as were presente, can witnes with me, almoste there was none, who dyd not prophesye and plainly spake the plagues that are begonne, and assuredly shall ende. Mayster Grindall plainlye spake the death of the Kynges maiestie, complayninge vpponhys housholde seruauntes, who, neyther feared to raile againste the woorde off God, and agaynste the trewe preachers of the same.

That godly and feruent man mayster Leuer, playnlye spake the desolacion off thys common wealthe. And mayster Bradforde (whome God for Christes hys sonne sacke comforte to the ende) spared not the proudest of them, but boldely declared, that Goddes vengeaunce shortlye shoulde strycke, those that then were in auctoritie, because they lothed and abhorred the trew worde of the euerlastinge God, and willed them to take example by a noble man, who became so colde in hearing God's worde, that the year before his death, he wold not disease himselfe to heare a sermon. God punisshed hym (sayde that godly preacher) and shall he spare you that be dubble more wicked? No, ye shal saye, will ye, or will ye not, ye shal drinke of the cup of the Lordes wrathe, *Judicium domini, Judicium domini.* The iudgement of the Lord, the iudgement of the Lorde, cryeth he with a lamentable voyce, and weaping teares. Master Haddon, most lernedly opened the causes of the byepassed plagues, and assured them, that the worse was after to come, if repentaunce shortly were not founde.

Muche more I harde of these foure, and of others, which now I maye not rehearce, and that (which is to be noted) after that the hole counsail had sayd they wolde heare no mo of their sermons they were vndiscrete felowes, yea, and pratynge knaues. But I will not speake all; for yf God contynew me in this troble, I purpose to prepare a dysshe, for suche as then ledde the ryng, yea, who but they? but nowe they haue bene at the skoole of *Placebo*, and ther they haue lerned amongst ladyes to daunse as the deuill lyst to pype. Agaynst those whom God hath stryken seing now resteth to them no place of repentaunce, nothing mynd I to speake. But such as lyue to this dai, wold be admonisshed that he that hath punished the one, wil not spare the rest."—*Sig.* A. vii.

I say nothing here of Knox's own predictions or threatenings, uttered after the time when he considered the restoration of idolatry and superstitution as at once the effect and the cause of those divine judgments which were in the course of being poured out on guilty England. My object is rather to show the strain which had been adopted at an earlier period, in order that it may be borne in mind and compared with subsequent matters, and for this the single quotation which I have given may suffice. Indeed I ought, perhaps, to apologise for offering such long extracts from printed books to occupy that part of the Magazine which is

devoted to "original" matter[1]. But I sincerely believe that some of the extracts which I have already given, and some now on my table, are, to most readers, quite as "original" as anything that could be laid before them; and I am sure they are much more interesting and instructive than anything really "original" which I could offer. They are chiefly taken from books which are not easily obtained, and in fact so seldom met with, that to many who are well versed in history they are unknown except by name, or some very few references or extracts. Some such books, which are even thus known to but few, and perhaps only imperfectly or erroneously estimated by extracts which have been given from them, but which happen (from circumstances which I need not particularize) to have fallen into my hands, I may perhaps bring before the reader; for to say the truth, I rather wish him to understand that, under pretence of apology, I am not so much asking forgiveness for past transgression, as indulgence for the future. For what else can I do? We are come to a very important question—one which, if we desire to understand the history of our country, and, in particular, of our church, must be fairly met. What was the real state of the question between the English Government and the Exiles? Was the government simply and purely persecuting the innocent? Were the exiles simply and purely testifying the truth, and suffering for the gospel?

And yet, if anybody asks the question, the first and most natural answer is to tell him to look at the acts, and read the works, of the exiles. But if he replies, "Where shall I learn their acts, and how shall I get their works?" one can only answer, "You must do the best you can. If you take the trouble to pick up information about them, you will find by degrees that almost everything purporting to be an account of their actions is very defective, and generally much discoloured, if not actually depraved, by party and prejudice on one side or another; and that in too many cases, the writer who has preserved the fact, has done it to serve a turn, and only gives you what suits his own pur-

[1] Of course the remarks which follow with reference to this point are not strictly applicable to the Essays when collected into a volume; but I let them stand because I am as desirous now, as I was then, to convey the spirit of them to the mind of the reader.

pose; and as to their works, you must go to public libraries, or to the few collectors of scarce books, who have gleaned a few handfuls. Sometimes you may pick up one or two from booksellers at less than their weight in gold." So that it really does appear to me, that any one who undertakes to write about those persons and that period, cannot, in justice to his reader, his subject, or himself, do otherwise than extract largely from books which, though now scarcely known except by name, are the sources of that knowledge which we have, and may be made to furnish a great deal more.

Let me, however, before I prceed to any such extracts, say a few words in illustration of what I have just now remarked on the difficulty of collecting and clearly understanding even the historical facts connected with those who took a very prominent part in ecclesiastical affairs; for this is a point that is quite worth a page of exemplification; and a striking instance is offered in the case of a prelate whom I introduced in the preceding paper, and whose principal work is one of the very first that should be noticed in an inquiry respecting the politics of the exiles. Dr. John Ponet, as I have already told the reader, on the authority of Strype, after having been chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer and King Henry VIII., was elevated to the see of Rochester, and thence, on the deprivation of Bishop Gardiner, translated to Winchester. I gave also Strype's statement that he was "one of the best and eminentest sort of divines," and "one of those many brave shoots that the university then produced[2]." I am not aware that any life of Bishop Ponet has been written; and Strype is of course the writer to whom most readers would look for information; and I believe that his works furnish more than is to be found collected anywhere else. That they contain a good deal will be obvious from the following extract from the General Index to Strype's works:—

[2] I might have added, on the same authority, that on his going to Winchester, he "had 2000 marks *settled upon him:* the rest of the temporalities of this rich benefice being taken into the king's hands."—*Mem.* II. ii. 166; but we were then only concerned with his style as a writer; and any little arrangement that might have been made with regard to his preferment had nothing to do with that question. Coming to look at him as a politician the case is somewhat different.

"Ponet, Poynet, John. C. 99. M. II. i. 65, 536. C. 444. 513. 631. 955. 1056. A. II. ii. 500. quoted, Ch. 108. a Kentish man, and of Queen's college Cambridge, C. 607. bred up under Sir T. Smith at Cambridge, S. 20, 159. adopted Cheke's mode of pronouncing Greek. 13. Ch. 18. chaplain to archbishop Cranmer, S. 20. C. 240. 607, translated Ochin's Dialogues against the Pope's primacy, M. II. i. 309. consecrated bishop of Rochester, C. 363. M. II. i. 403. particulars of the ceremony, C. 363. the first bishop consecrated according to the new form of ordination, 274. assisted at the consecration of bishop Hoper, 364. allowed a benefice *in commendam*, and why, M. II. i. 343. in a commission against anabaptists, 385. ii. 200. made bishop of Winchester, i. 483. ii. 166. 260. 263. 264. 266. C. 323. one of the commissioners to reform the ecclesiastical laws, 388. consulted about allowing princess Mary to have mass, M.II. i. 451. notice of his book in favour of the marriage of priests, ii. 54. answered by Martin, 55. notice of the answer to Martin's answer to this book of his, III. i. 233. 524. P. i. 67. II. 446. C. 75. 473. 474. 1058. Day has a license to print his works, M.II. ii. 114. cordially favoured Religion, 166. his chaplains, *ib.* has a license to preach and to license preachers, 262. a difference between him and archdeacon Philpot, caused by Cook, his registrar, III. i. 439. deprived and imprisoned, tem. queen Mary, C. 443. fled abroad, 449. M.II. ii. 166. ch. 95. resident at Argentine, M.III. i. 232. his character of bishop Gardiner, 450. notice of his book of Politic Power, 535. died in exile, P.I. 67. A.II. i. 350. bishop Parkhurst's epigram to him, ii. 501. devised the summer-house at Lambeth palace, P.II. 26. 79. conjectured by some to be the author of *Catechismus Brevis Christianæ Disciplinæ*, &c. C. 422."

It is clear that a good deal may be learned about this bishop merely from this Index; and even the reader to whom all these references to the various works of Strype are simply unintelligible, will understand, that those works must contain a great deal more. Yet I believe, that if he doggedly turns out every one of these numerous references, he will find but one allusion of any kind to that which was undoubtedly one of the most remarkable events in the life of Ponet. If there had been no allusion at all, I should have felt bound to suppose (strange as such a supposition might be) that Strype really did not know anything about the matter; but as there is a distinct reference, and that in one of Strype's earliest works, it does seem strange that in all his subsequent notices of "one of the best and eminentest sort of divines," there should be no hint of the fact —or, perhaps the historian would have said, the charge— that he "fled abroad," because he was a rebel and a traitor, and was afraid of being taken in arms against his sovereign, and hanged at Tyburn. Whether one form or other of

religion had, or had not, anything to do with the matter, it seems clear that the proximate cause of his exile was the fear of the gallows; or perhaps, mixed with it, some notion that he might meet with unpleasant treatment as a deserter —seeing that when his leader got into difficulty he left him to shift for himself, promising to pray for his success—a good office which might be performed out of gunshot, and in such a manner that, if the worst happened, it could not be proved at Guildhall. He seems, in short, to have been deeply engaged as a leader, if not as an original plotter and instigator, in Sir Thomas Wyat's insurrection; and to have been actually with that unhappy rebel on the morning of the very day on which he was taken prisoner, Feb. 7th, 1554.

Stow describes with graphic simplicity the distress of the rebel leader, when, about six miles from London, "a piece of his great Ordinance" was most unluckily "dismounted by breach of the wheeles;" and proceeds to tell us that, "Whilest Wyat and his counsell were deuising how to raise 'his ordinance dismounted, many of his society slipped from 'him, among the which, M. Harper was one, who went to 'the Court, and opened all the premises aforesayd to the 'Queene and Counsell; where Wyat was, what had chanced, 'and what was his intention. The breaking of the said Gun 'was such an hinderance to his enterprise, that all about 'him were amazed, and at their wits end, because by that 'meanes the houre was broken of appointment. Where-'fore, Vaughan, Bret, and other approoued souldiers and 'counsellers, such as had wise heads in other affaires, as 'Doct. Poinet and other, did counsell the said Wyat to 'march forwards and keep his appointment, and to let the 'Gun lie, which in no wise hee could be perswaded to do. 'Doct. Poinet Bishop of Winchester, therefore, considering 'how many of his confederacy was stolne away from him, 'he began to persuade with Captain Bret and other his 'friends to shift for themselves as he would doe; and, at 'that very place where the Gun did breake, he tooke his 'leaue of his secret friends, and said he would pray vnto 'God for their good successe, and so did depart, and went 'into Germany, where he died."

Now all this is passed over by Strype in one single, cool, easy sentence; and that, too, in a passage in which he is professedly giving some account of Bishop Ponet—a pro-

fession which perhaps extorted the bare mention of a circumstance which is, as I have already said, to the best of my knowledge, nowhere else even hinted at by him. Strype's sentence is this—"One of our historians writes that he was 'with Sir Thomas Wyat in his insurrection: and after his 'defeat, fled into Germany, where, in the city of Strasburgh, 'he died about the year 1556. But Bale speaks not a word 'of his being with Wyat."

This is very likely. It would have been very ungracious in the chaplain to have said anything about the discomfited treason of his patron, though he might, and probably did, himself love and respect him for it. Indeed, if Bale had not had a "Vocacyon" to the bishopric of Ossory in Ireland, and if "his harde chaunces therein and finall delyuerance" therefrom, had not landed him in another part of Europe shortly before Wyat's rising, it seems not unlikely that he would have been in the thick of it. To say the truth, I should not be much surprised to find that he actually was there; for I have tried in vain to find where he was just at that time. In his own account of himself, this point appears to be involved in studied obscurity. It is, however, only justice to him to add that there is one circumstance in the proceedings of Wyat's party, while they lay in Southwark, which seems as if Bale's hand was not in it. Whatever may have been his faults and vices, he had a sincere love of letters. One can imagine that he might have approved of Wyat's laying one "peece of ordinance" out of the five, "toward the Bishop of Winchester's house," and have offered no great opposition when, as Stow quaintly observes, "diuers of his company being Gentlemen (as they said) went to Winchester place," and "made havocke of the Bishops goods;" but I think he would not have sanctioned, and the more I see of him and his times, the more I am disposed to believe that he would have had influence to prevent, one feature of barbarism which characterized the pillage. Stow tells us that they made havock "not onely 'of his victuals, whereof there was plenty, but whatsoeuer 'els, not leaving so much as one locke of a doore, but the 'same was taken off and carried away, nor a book in his 'gallery or library vncut, or rent into pieces, so that men 'might have gone vp to the knees in leaues of bookes, cut 'out and throwne vnder feete."

However, whether Bale was there or not—and after all I should not be surprised to find that he was not far off, though he might not know of, or be able to prevent, a sudden act of barbarism—it is, I believe, perfectly true, as Strype observes, that he "speaks not a word" of Ponet's being with Wyat; but then a very slight acquaintance with Bale's works is enough not only to convince one that he says many things which he should not say, but that he "speaks not a word" about a great many matters on which he could have given most ample and important information. Indeed, on all accounts, there is something very pleasant in the idea that a statement made by Stow respecting a matter of fact (to say nothing of the nature of *this* fact) is to be set aside, or in any degree discredited, or damaged, because it is not noticed by Bale. One is strongly reminded of the culprit who complained of the injustice of convicting him of stealing potatoes on the testimony of three or four witnesses who had seen him do it, when he was prepared to bring forward twice as many who had *not* seen him. But, of course, the reader must consider, in balancing authorities, that Stow's account is one given by a Londoner (the man of all others entitled to that name) of things which happened in London when he was at least twenty-eight years old; and that if he was not "pars magna," or any part at all, (as an honest tailor had certainly no business to be in such a fray,) yet that he undoubtedly saw with *his* own eyes, and heard with his own ears, many of the events of those most singular, and now obscure, days. Why, "the noyse of 'women and children, when the conflict was at Charing 'Crosse, was so great that it was heard at the top of the 'white tower, and also the great shot was well discerned 'there out of St. Iames field;" and do you think John Stow was out of sight and hearing? or sitting cross-legged at his needle? Truly his whole narrative, and his whole after-life, leads one to think it much more likely that he was peering about, and saw with his own eyes Sir Thomas Wyat when, after being repulsed from Ludgate, "he stayed and rested him awhile vpon a stall cuer against the Bell Sauvage gate." Perhaps it would be no violent exercise of imagination to suspect that he took a walk the next day to see the "great Gun" which had caused so much trouble, and which, grinning destruction even as it lay dismounted in the ruts, so

affected his peaceful mind, that he invariably honours it with a capital letter. A slight, and perhaps involuntary, tribute to fallen greatness; but what more could a merchant-tailor do for the "Gun," when all Wyat's horses, and all Wyat's men, could do nothing?

But seriously—for this matter of authorities is a very serious one—if this period of history is to be studied, recourse must be had to Strype's works; and this, not only because they contain many things not to be found elsewhere, and correct many things which have been misstated by others, but because they are the most accessible, and readable, and stretch over so long a period, that, voluminous as they are, they may still be said to offer "multum in parvo" when viewed in reference either to shelf-room, or purchase-money. They must be, they will be, and they ought to be, read by all men who profess to have, or to desire, any knowledge of the History of England; and he who can study them without being sensible of his obligations to the writer, without acknowledging and admiring his good purpose, his integrity, simplicity, and industry, must be a stupid or a bad man. At the same time, he who takes Strype for his authority, without being aware of the honest spirit of prostrate "hero-worship" in which he wrote biography, and which seems to have rendered him incapable of estimating, or almost of considering, the genuineness, authenticity, or weight, of documents on which he relied, or the character and authority of writers whom he quoted, will be sadly misled.

To return, however, to Bishop Ponet. Of course when he had left Sir Thomas Wyat, the best thing that he could do was to leave England; for whether treason prospered or not, he was likely to be in an awkward predicament if he remained. So he "fled abroad," and wrote, "A shorte Treatise of 'politike pouuer, and of the true Obedience which subiectes 'owe to Kynges and other ciuile Gouernours, with an Ex-'hortacion to all true naturall Englishe men:" a work which is certainly entitled to particular notice, not only because it emanated from a person of more ability and higher station than most of his party, but because the author's practice forms so clear and plain a commentary on his doctrine. He and his "secret friends" were not closeted schoolmen who in the perlustration of all things and every thing else, hit

upon the question of 'killing no murder,' and spoke daggers without a thought of using them. Ponet's valour seems to have lain chiefly in his tongue and pen, and to have been of that superior kind which consists in a very high degree of discretion, suggesting to its possessor, not merely that, "he who fights and runs away, may live to fight another day;" but that he who runs away without fighting, has a better chance of coming to a future conflict unmutilated. But what valour he had was unquestionable as to its kind. He stood by the rebel chief as long as there was any hope that treason might prosper, and truth prevail, by means of great pieces of ordinance. We are not to look for obscure quiddities, or dark hints, or dubious imaginations, or mystical meanings in his book. When this "brave shoot" heads a chapter "Wether it be laufull to depose an euil gouernour, and kill a tyranne," we know what he is about at once,—we want no canon of interpretation but the "great Gun."

I have, however, occupied so much more space than I expected by this prefatory, but I believe very necessary matter, that instead of entering into any discussion of Ponet's work in this paper, I will but add two remarks with general reference to such extracts as I hope to offer hereafter.

Two modes of arrangement immediately present themselves.

First, the order of time; and this I should be very glad to follow; but in dealing with books of this kind and period, it is not easy, if possible, to do it. For, in the first place, some have no dates, and offer no precise internal evidence. Secondly, some may be very reasonably suspected of wrong dates, as it is beyond all question that they bear the names of wrong places. Thirdly, in dealing with works intended for clandestine circulation among a particular sect or community, we must calculate on the probability of their having been passed from hand to hand, and circulated for a considerable time, in manuscript before they were printed at all. Fourthly, (and I would take the liberty of throwing it out as a hint to the editors of books belonging to this period,) we must be cautious how we judge of the date of a fact, or of the date of a book, because the fact is recorded in the book. The volume, without bearing any mark of it, may be a reprint with alterations, or interpolations, which may

lead to mistakes in opinions respecting dates formed upon them.

A second order which suggests itself is that of subjects; but this it would be difficult to accomplish, and if it were done it would only mince the matter into unintelligible or uninteresting scraps, and on the whole convey an indistinct, and in some degree incorrect, impression. For, in fact, there is only one great subject; or, to speak more strictly, it is to what I consider as the great subject of the books, and the great object of the writers, that I wish to call the attention of the reader. I mean the promotion of a revolution in the government of England by the dethronement of Queen Mary. As to the subdivisions which it may be right to make in considering this point, I hope to speak hereafter.

ESSAY VI.

PURITAN POLITICS. No. II.

RELATING TO THE DUTY OF SUBJECTS TO THEIR RULERS GENERALLY.

KNOX—GOODMAN—WHITTINGHAM—KETHE—BECON—THE SUPPLICACYON—BRADFORD—PONET.

It has been already stated, that a great object of the books which were written and sent over to this country by the protestant exiles, was to promote a revolution in the English Government by the dethronement of Queen Mary. The only difficulty in proving this, is that which arises from having to make a selection amidst a superabundance of evidence.

It is true, that much which would have increased that difficulty is lost. Many of the worst productions of that period—the worst, not only in a moral and religious point of view, but as being the most prejudicial, passing from hand to hand or from mouth to mouth, amongst the worst people, and such as were most easily excited to the worst practices—the profane ballad, that regaled the devotees of

the ale-house; the seditious broadside, scattered in the streets by unseen hands; the interlude, that amused a simple and untaught audience with blasphemous ribaldry concerning the holiest and most sacred mysteries of religion—these are now seldom to be met with. But for our purpose the loss is the less to be regretted, because they mostly lie open to the objection, that as there probably never was a time when their authorship could be certainly fixed, so it is altogether impossible at this distance of time to attempt anything of the kind; and, also, that for anything we can prove, these very abominations may have been forged by the enemies of the puritans for the express purpose of bringing them into trouble. I lay no stress, therefore, on works of this description, though it may, on some occasions, be worth while, for the sake of illustration, to refer to them[1]. But I will beg the reader to bear in mind, that however obscure our intelligence respecting them may be, these things were in existence, and in active operation, while I quit them to speak, as Doctor (afterwards Archbishop) Parker did to the Lord Keeper Bacon, of certain books, "that went then 'about London, being printed and spread abroad, and their

[1] This is not the place to enter into details on a very curious subject, but it may be to the purpose to refer to the case of Bartlet Green, whose history occupies a considerable space in Fox's Martyrology. (Vol. VII. p. 732. 8vo Ed.) He was a young Templar, the ground of whose apprehension Fox states very obscurely. "The cause hereof," he says, "was 'a letter which Green did write unto the said Goodman, containing as 'well the report of certain *Demands* or *Questions*, which were cast 'abroad in London, (as appeareth hereafter in a letter of his own pen-'ning)," &c. Green, in the letter thus referred to, in which he gives an account of his having been examined as to the cause of his imprisonment, says, "I said that the occasion of mine apprehension was a letter which 'I wrote to one Christopher Goodman, wherein (certifying him of such 'news as happened here) among the rest, I wrote that there were certain '*printed papers of questions* scattered abroad. Whereupon, [was this '*quite* all?] being suspected to be privy unto the devising or publishing 'of the same, I was committed to the Fleet," &c. Perhaps, however, the reader may hereafter come to doubt whether the very circumstance of correspondence with "one Christopher Goodman" was not enough to raise some suspicion of any man, and whether the "whereupon" might not admit of considerable expansion and illustration. Unfortunately for our curiosity, Bishop Bonner waived that matter altogether on the ground the prisoner was sent to him only on account of heresy spoken or written since his committal to the Fleet. Whether Green knew more or less of these *Questions*, how much do we know? I am not aware of any testimony to their existence, but this obscure notice.

'authors *ministers of good estimation.* . . . . At which, said 'Parker, *exhorrui cum ista legerem.* Adding, 'if such prin-'ciples be spread into men's heads, as now they be framed, 'and referred to the judgment of the subject to discuss '*what is tyranny*, and to discern whether his prince, his 'landlord, his master, is a tyrant by his own fancy and 'collection supposed; what Lord of the Council shall ride 'quietly-minded in the streets among desperate beasts? 'what minister shall be sure in his bedchamber?'"[2] Important questions. I do not know what the Lord Keeper answered.

Three of these exiled "ministers of good estimation"—Bale, Ponet, and Traheron—have been already introduced to the reader; and I will now briefly mention four others.

JOHN KNOX is a person so well known that it is needless to waste room in describing him. At the same time, it is probable that most readers know more of him as the Reformer in Scotland, than as the exile in Geneva and Frankfort.[3] It is enough, however, for our purpose, to say that during his exile in the former place he published his famous work, entitled, "*The First Blast of the Trvmpet against the monstrvovs regiment of women.*" It is a little book of 112 pages, in sixteens, and in a type about the size of that which is here used. It is chiefly to this work of his that we have occasion, at present, to refer.

CHRISTOPHER GOODMAN is not so popularly known as his friend Knox; but he was a person of eminence and importance among the exiles. "He was born," says Anthony a Wood, "in Cheshire, particularly, as I conceive, within the city of Chester;" but he can add little more than that he became a student of Brasenose in 1536, aged seventeen or thereabouts, and took one degree in arts. In 1544, he proceeded in that faculty, and in three years after became a senior student of Christ Church, then newly founded. In 1551, or thereabouts, he was admitted to the reading of the

---

[2] Strype, Life of Parker, I. 85.

[3] Every one who wishes to understand this period must read "The Troubles of Frankfort;" and the public is much indebted to Mr. Petheram for having reprinted that rare and valuable book with so much accuracy, and in such a cheap and readable form.

sentences, "at which time he was (as 'tis said) reader of 'the divinity lesson in the university, but whether of that 'founded by the Lady Margaret or by K. Henry VIII. 'seems as yet doubtful."[4] From this Wood passes at once to his exile, which according to this account seems to have begun when he was about thirty-five years of age. The precise time or occasion of his flight I do not find.[5] He first appears among the exiles, I believe, by his signature to a letter dated from Strasburgh, the 23rd of November, 1554. Parsons, in his Three Conversions[6], charges him with having been implicated in the conspiracy against the queen's life, for which William Thomas was executed on the 17th of May in that year. Whether this is true or not, it is certain that Goodman highly approved of Wyat's rebellion, and was anxious to have it known how much he deplored its failure. Whether, like Ponet, he was actually in the rebel party, does not appear; but, like him, when he got on the safe side of the water, and had "pen, ink, paper, and quietness,"[7] he abused those blessings by writing a book on politics, intituled, "*How svperior powers ought to be obeyd of their svbiects: and wherin they may lawfully by Gods Worde be disobeyed and resisted. Wherein also is declared the cause of all this present miserie in England, and the onely way to remedy the same.*" This

[4] Athenæ, I. 171. Ed. Bliss.

[5] His friend Bartlet Green, already mentioned, in his "Confession and Saying," (Fox, VII. 738,) vouches for his having been in England on Easter Sunday (March 25), 1554; for "he the said Bartlet, two times, to wit, at two Easter tides or days, in the chamber of John Pulline, one 'of the preachers in King Edward's time, within the parish of St. 'Michael's, Cornhill, of the diocese of London, did receive the communion 'with the said Pulline, and Christopher Goodman, sometime reader of 'the divinity lecture in Oxford, now gone beyond the sea." As there is some ambiguity in Fox's language, I may add that it was the chamber which was in the parish of St. Michael, Cornhill. John Pulline, or Pulleyn, had been rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, before his exile, and was reinstated on his return, and afterwards had the archdeaconry of Colchester, with other preferment. Perhaps this may be the place to which Wood refers when he tells us "'tis said" Goodman was reader of the divinity lesson in Oxford. As we have had occasion to notice Green's letter to "one Christopher Goodman" it may be added, that beside the news about the "printed papers of questions" it informed him that the queen was "not *yet* dead."

[6] Vol. II. p. 220.

[7] Strype, Mem. III. i. 234.

book, like that of Knox, is printed at Geneva in sixteens, but with a smaller type, and consisting of 238 pages, so that it is, in fact, a much larger work.[8]

WILLIAM WHITTINGHAM, fellow of All-Souls' College, Oxford, in 1545, and two years after a senior scholar of Christ Church on its foundation, is said by Anthony a Wood to have had leave to travel for three years, commencing on the 17th May, 1550, and to have married a Frenchwoman, and remained abroad till the latter end of King Edward's reign. Whether this necessarily implies that he then came to England, and if he did, why, or precisely when, he returned to the Continent, I do not find; but it is clear that he was one of the first exiles that came to Frankfort, where he arrived on the 27th of June, 1554; being then, if Wood's chronology is correct, about thirty years of age. He was at this time a layman; but being of the more violent party, which in the time of the Troubles seceded from Frankfort and went to Geneva, and having, at the urgent solicitation of Calvin, been (as Anthony a Wood says) "made a minister according to the Genevan fashion," he took charge of the English congregation there; it having been left without a pastor, by Knox's removal to Frankfort. This, the only ordination that he ever received, furnished a subject of discussion when he afterwards became Dean of Durham, and his fellow-exile, Sandys, was Archbishop of York. But with these matters we are not at present particularly concerned. He who wishes to know about "the works of impiety that he performed while he sate Dean of Durham," may learn

[8] Perhaps I may be allowed to append a bibliographical remark on this rare book, which readers who are not interested in such inquiries may pass over; but on which those who are, may be able to give, or glad to receive, information. Herbert, vol. iii. p. 1597, describes this work from his own copy, and I doubt not very accurately; but while there is perfect agreement on most points, there is one variation in the Lambeth copy. This has indeed the "pythagorean Y" but no "youth is tumbling down" from the broad side, and no "laurel crown" decorates the narrow side. On the other hand, there is (what he does not mention) a scroll running across behind the upper part of the Y, and streaming down the side opposite to Pythagoras, bearing in capital letters the motto INTRATE PER ARCTAM VIAM so divided that the two former words appear between the branches of the Y, and the two latter in the part of the scroll which streams down. Were there two editions, or was the device changed in the course of the impression?

somewhat from Anthony a Wood, who says, generally, that they were "very many"; and a great deal more from Strype, who enters farther into detail. Our business is with his proceedings at an earlier period, and how important a person he was among the exiles, the fact just stated of his appointment at Geneva, and many other things related in the "Troubles of Frankfort," sufficiently testify; and the particular fact which we have to notice is, that when Goodman published the book which has just been described, Whittingham prefixed an epistle, headed by his name, not only committing himself to the contents of the work, but actually claiming for it that kind and degree of deferential respect which is due to none but the inspired writings. How strangely do extremes meet; but it is really a puritan who speaks:—

"Remembering that the worthy people of Beroe were commended by the holy Gost, because they tryed by God's worde whether the ministers preaching agreed with the same or no. Seing then by these examples we are bonde to seke the wil of God manifested vnto vs in his Scriptures, what excuse shal we alledge for our pretended ignorance? *Beholde here thou hearest the Eternal speaking by his minister, in whose mouthe he hath put his worde, and whose lippes must kepe the Lawe and the vnderstanding thereof, as wryteth the Prophet Malachie. Beware therfore that thou neglect not him that bringeth the worde of God, but quickely gyue eare and obey.* For if thou desirest to knowe thy duetie to thy Prince, and his charge likewise ouer thee, read this book and thou shalt wel vnderstande both: If thou wishe for Christian libertie, come and se how it may easely be had: If thou woldest loue God aboue man, here thou shalt knowe how to obey God rather than man. Let the Apostles of Christ here be thy schole maisters, and then the more thou learnest the lesse occasion shalt thou haue to repent."—Pref. p. 7.

WILLIAM KETHE is said to have been a Scotchman; and this seems to be all that is now known of his condition previous to his appearing among the exiles. His name is subscribed to a letter dated from Frankfort as early as December 3, 1554, and the whole history shows that he was a person of weight and influence; especially the important and delicate mission with which he was entrusted among "the congregations and companies that were dispersed in sundry places off Germany and Helvetia," when the accession of Elizabeth, and the consequent prospect of return, made it so desirable that the divisions among the brethren, sometimes characterized by bitter wrath "so boilinge hott

that it ran ouer on bothe sides, and yet no fier quenched,"[9] should be assuaged, or at least made the best of. To many readers the names of Kethe and Whittingham are unknown, and it might create surprise if I should speak of them as two of the English poets, whose compositions have passed through more editions, had more readers, and are even at this day laid up in more memories, than those of almost any other writers—yet what is there of Milton or Pope, of Scott or Byron, that can in these points vie with, "My soul praise the Lord, speak good of his name," and "The Lord is only my support, and he that doth me feed?"[1] Whittingham, as I have already said, prefixed a prose epistle to his friend Goodman's book. Kethe appended a copy of verses, and how far they made him responsible for the doctrine of the work the reader will be enabled to judge for himself.

I have now mentioned six writers who were all undeniably men of consideration, and leading influence, in the exiled party; and for the present I add a notice of only one more. Him, moreover, I name rather on account of his character and station both before and after Queen Mary's time, than because he can be proved to have taken any leading or active part in the affairs of the banished protestants. Indeed, except the mere statement of the fact, I have found but little about his exile, and cannot help supposing, that at this period (as he had done in the reign of Henry VIII.) he must have lived, whether at home or abroad, under some feigned name. It will, however, be sufficient for our present purpose to quote a few lines from Strype's Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer.

"THOMAS BECON, a Suffolk man, seems to have been his 'chaplain. To Cranmer, Becon dedicated his treatise of 'Fasting: wherein he mentioned several benefits he had 'received from the Archbishop; one whereof was, his 'making him one of the six preachers of Canterbury. He

[9] Troubles of Frankfort, f. 135.

[1] I am not comparing their poetry; though really the Old Version has been so modernized, that few persons would be prepared to form a judgment on this point. Kethe, I believe, versified six Psalms, the 104, 107, 112, 113, 122, 125. Whittingham fifteen, 23, 37, 50, 51, 114, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126, 127, 130, 133, 134, 137. They are distinguished by the versifier's initials.

'was deprived, in Queen Mary's reign, as all the other five 'were, for being married. He was a famous writer, as well 'as preacher, in the reigns of King Henry, King Edward, 'Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth. So eminent, that he 'was one of the three (Vernon" [*read* Veron] "and Bradford 'being the other two) that were sent for by Queen Mary's 'council, and committed to the Tower in the beginning of 'her reign, viz., August 16, 1553[2]: from whence he was not 'delivered till March 22 following. During which time, as 'he complained himself, he underwent a miserable imprison-'ment. To conceal himself in those dangerous times, he 'went by the name of Theodore Basil[3]: and was one of 'those authors, whose names were specified in a severe 'proclamation put forth by King Philip and Queen Mary,

---

[2] That is, on the Wednesday after the Sunday of the tumult at Paul's Cross, when a dagger was thrown at the preacher. See Mr. Haweis's most valuable *Sketches of the Reformation*, p. 35. I do not mean to say that Becon was implicated in that disturbance, nor do I know that the alleged ground of his apprehension is anywhere stated. These dates are given by himself.

[3] Strype seems here to say that he took this name in the time of Queen Mary, which would, I believe, be a mistake. That he published works under that name in the reign of Henry VIII., and that, in that reign, he was caused to recant and burn his books, is clear; but *that* would hardly form a ground for his reassuming the name in the time of Queen Mary. Moreover, I know of no reason whatever for imagining that he *did* assume it at that time. I do not recollect that the name of either Thomas Becon, or Theodore Basil, once occurs in the Troubles of Frankfort, or in any list of exiles with which I am acquainted. Yet if he was amongst them, everything renders it probable that he would have taken an active part, and that a prominent place would have been assigned to him. The circumstance brings to one's mind certain words used by the Protector Somerset in writing to Bishop Gardiner, to whom, of all men, it was least necessary to explain them, but on which no doubt either of the parties could have given a commentary which would be very interesting to us—"They which already be banished and have forsaken the 'realm, as suffering the last punishment, be boldest to set forth their 'mind; and dare use their extreme licence or liberty of speaking, as out 'of the hands of rule or correction, either because they be *gone*, or 'because they be *hid*." There can be little doubt that some who were really in the latter class, were supposed to belong to the former. If one believed, that the little book which I quote was really "Imprynted at Strasburgh in Elsas at the signe of the golden Bibell, In the moneth of Auguste, the yeare of our Lord 1554," it might throw some light on the matter; but that seems very doubtful. It will be found among those works of Becon which have been recently reprinted by the Parker Society.

'1555, as being writers of books, which, as contrary to the 'Pope and Roman-catholic religion, were forbidden to be 'brought into England, or used, and commanded diligently 'to be searched for, and brought to the ordinary, upon 'penalty of the statute of Henry IV. against heresy. After 'his delivery from prison, skulking about for some time, at 'length he saved himself by exile."[4]

As far as I am aware, the only work of Becon to which I have occasion to refer at present is, "*An humble suppli-'cation vnto God, for the restoringe of hys holy woorde, vnto 'the churche of Englande, mooste mete to be sayde in these 'oure dayes euen with teares of euery true and faythfull 'Englyish harte.*" It is a little book, in the small octavo size then common, printed in black letter, and consisting of thirty-six leaves. Although the title imports as much, it may be proper to add, that it really is written in the form of one long prayer, from beginning to end.

It is not necessary to delay our progress by adding any account of other authors or works which may be hereafter incidentally mentioned, and which it will be sufficient to notice as they come before us; except only that I would mention two works—one anonymous, and the other, if not pseudonymous, written by somebody not much worth inquiring about, if we may credit his own account of himself.

"A SUPPLICACYON TO THE QUENES MAIESTIE" is the whole title of the first of these works, and the publisher had the impudence to add at the foot of the title-page, "Impryntid at London, by John Cawoode Prynter tho (*sic*) the quenes Mayestie wyth here most gracyns (*sic*) lycence." It is dated at the end, "Anno M.D.L.," which seems obviously a misprint for MDLV., as on f. 24, the author dates the work, "26 January 1555," and then adds a postscript, in which he mentions the martyrdom of Bishop Hooper, and the others who suffered in the month of February in that year. It consists of twenty-eight leaves, the last of which is blank; and is printed in that modern gothic, or German, type which is best known from its having been used in printing Coverdale's Bible.

JOHN BRADFORD, if there was such a person—for nobody, I believe, supposes it to have been the well-known martyr

[4] Strype's Mem. of Cran. Vol. II. p. 607. 8vo Edit.

of that name—wrote a book to put his countrymen on their guard against the Spaniards. It was not, however, after the puritan model, but with a professed abhorrence of the heretics and their new religion. The author was, or pretended to be, a staunch Romanist, and does not spare the "pestiferous bokes and letters lately printed in Englyshe 'under the cloke of a fervent zeale, or loue towardes our 'country against Spaniardes, by the deuelishe deuice of 'certayne heretykes thinking thereby to grounde in the 'hartes of all people according to the olde accustomed and 'most cursed polices of the deuill, many abominable heresies, 'and moste detestable errors, stinking before the face of 'God, and man. One of the which bokes," he adds, "hath 'come to my hands, entitled, A Supplicacion to the Quenes 'maiestie," &c.

It is of no great consequence for our purpose, but I must confess myself inclined to suspect that this little book might possibly come from the same quarter as the 'Supplication to the Queen's Majesty' and other things of a like nature; and that the profession of orthodox popery, joined to such zealous patriotism, and hatred of strangers, might be all a pretence. It is curious that Strype does not seem to be aware of its having been printed, and gives it, or a great part of it, from the "Foxii MSS.," a miscellany of very curious matter, and to say the truth, a source which tends to heighten my doubt of the genuineness of the work. What he gives, however, differs a good deal from the printed copy which is now before me, very appropriately bound up in one volume with Knox's "Blast" and Goodman's "How to obey." I am sorry to add that the title-page is lost, and therefore I am obliged to be content with giving the following from Herbert, who possessed the book:—"The Copye of a letter sent by John Bradford to 'the right honorable lordes the Erles of Arundel, Darbie, 'Shrewsbury, and Penbroke, declaring the nature of 'spaniardes, and discouering the most detestable treasons, 'which they haue pretended moste falselye againste our 'moste noble Kyngdome of Englande. Whereunto is 'added a tragical blast of the papistical trompet for maynte-'naunce of the Popes Kingdome in Englande, by T.E." &c.[5]

[5] Herbert, III. 1582.

The name of the modest poet who has only favoured us with his initials, I do not pretend to conjecture; but under the introduction of his friend Bradford, he may perhaps be allowed to give us his verses, which are worth reading, on the ground that there is not much of them, and that what there is particularly concerns our inquiry. How such verses came to be appended to such a book, on any other supposition than that it was published, if not written, by the puritan party, I do not understand.

From the works, then, which I have mentioned, I offer to the reader some extracts; and although, as I have already observed, to dissect them into the minute fragments which a strict classification might require, would render them uninteresting, if not unintelligible, yet it may be worth while to adopt some degree of arrangement, and at least to specify the various points to which I wish to direct the attention of the reader, several of which may sometimes be found in a single paragraph, or perhaps even a single sentence. He will not therefore expect a rigid adherence to system, though I venture to class the passages which belong to our inquiry under four heads.

I. Those which have generally a revolutionary tendency —which discuss the subject of government in such a way as to inculcate, not only the doctrine that the people have a right to resist the ruler whenever in their opinion he commands what is wrong, but that they are the source of power, and are answerable to God, not only for their delegation of it to fit persons as rulers, but for the use which they allow to be made of it by those to whom they have delegated it; and from whom upon the misuse of that power they are bound to resume it—these ideas being illustrated, enforced, and familiarized by perpetual repetitions of, and allusions to, histories respecting rulers deposed and killed by their subjects.

II. Those which were specially directed against Queen Mary individually, and which were of two kinds. (1.) Those which denied her right to the throne on the general ground of her sex, or on the more particular ground of illegitimacy. (2.) Those which were directed against her personal character, and which, by charging her with cruelty, oppression, &c., were calculated to render her odious.

III. Those which were directed against foreigners, and in

particular against the Spaniards, and the Spanish match; and which, under a profession of patriotism, urged that the people and the country had been, or would be, betrayed and sold into the hands of strangers and foreigners of the basest description, by whom they would be enslaved and oppressed without mercy, unless they rose up and expelled them.

IV. Those relating to the change in religion—representing it both as a judgment in itself, and as a sin which would bring down further judgments—and generally threatening judgments on the people of the country for rejecting the word of God, and embracing or tolerating idolatry and superstition.

On the first of these points Goodman's book claims precedence; both because of its general scope and pretension, and because, as Strype observes, "Though a little book in *decimo sexto*, it is full of bitterness, and encourageth to take up arms against Queen Mary, and to dethrone her." Strype adds, (and the reader will bear in mind,) that, "as it had 'Whittingham's preface at the beginning of it, so had it 'William Kethe, another divine at Geneva, his approbation 'in verse at the end"—"which verses," as Strype also very truly observes, "will show the intent of the book;"[6] and therefore they shall here be given by way of preface:—

"*William Kethe to the Reader.*

1. The vayne harte of man, full frayle is and blynde,
vncerteynely setled, and rest can none fynde:
Whose hap is in wandring, to wade the wronge way,
As one apte by kinde to runne still astraye.

2. For, what thinge so good by truethe hathe bene wroght,
Or what so well framed hath nature forth brought,
Which man is not prone by crafte to accuse,
And nature's good gyftes dothe not sore abuse?

3. Thus see we how man, contemning Gods grace,
Is wholie inclyned, that ill shulde take place:
Whose will (truethe reiectinge) delitth that to haue,
Which nature corrupted woulde seeme still to craue.

4. Sith man then in iudgeinge, so thwartly is bente.
To satisfie fansie, and not true intente:
How hardly in this case, can such iudge vpright,
When trueth doth but peepe out, as semth to our sight.

[6] Mem. III. ii. 131.

5. Ful nedefull then were it, we had this respecte,
Before we receaue ought, or ought to reiect:
The thinge to decide so with Iudgement and skill,
That trueth may be stickler, and not our one will.

6. Beholde here a trueth drawne forthe of her graue,
By power sore oppressed, and made a bonde slaue:
Whose chains, thogh this Autor could not rent or teare,
Yet hath he forth broght hir, in to moste clere ayer.

7. With whome now to reason, whoso wil assaye,
Shal learne how ill Rulers we oghte to obeye,
Whiche kill, how they care not, in their cruell rage,
Respecting their will more, then lawe, othe, or charge.

8. Whose fury longe fostered by suffrance and awe,
Haue right rule subuerted, and made will their lawe:
Whose pride, how to temper, this truthe will thee tell,
So as thou resiste mayste, and yet not rebell.

9. Rebellion is ill, to resiste is not so,
When right through resisting, is donne to that foo,
Who seeketh, but by ruine, agaynst right to raigne,
Not passinge what perishe, so she spoyle the gayne![7]

10. A publick weale wretched, and to farre disgraste,
Where the right head is of cut, and a wronge in steed plaste
A brut beast vntamed, a misbegot then,
More meete to be ruled, then raigne ouer men.

11. A maruelous madnesse, if we well beholde,
When sighes shall assaut men to see themselues solde:
And yet when from slauery, their friends woulde them free,
To stick to their foes so, still slaues to be.

12. For France spiteth Spayne, which Englend doth threat,
And England proud Spanyards, with salte woulde fayne eat:
Yet Englande proud Spayne aydeth with men, ships, and botes,
That Spayne, (France subdued once) may cut all their throtes.

13. A people peruerse, repleate with disdayne,
Thogh flattrie fayne hide wolde their hate, and vile trayne.
Whose rage, and hotte luste, disceate, crafte and pride,
Poor Naples their bondeslaue, with great grefe hath tryed.

14. Lo, these be the byrdes which Englande muste feede,
By plantinge of whom, to roote out their seede
Their owne landes and lyues, by them firste devourde,
Their maydes then and wyues, most vilelie deflourde.

15. Is this not stronge treason, ye vnnoble bloudds?
To ayde such destroyers, both with landes and goods?
But when they thus pinche you, and ye put to flight,
To what forte then flee you? or where will you light?

[7] So it stands; but it seems as if the words "spoyle the" should be transposed.

16. For Englande thus solde, for Spaniardes to dwell,
Ye maye not by right, possesse that ye sell.
They seinge your treason, agaynste your owne state,
Wil not with theirs truste you, which they know ye hate.

17. To Skotlande or France, yf ye then shulde cry,
Your vile deeds now present, they may well reply,
And Dutchland abhorth you: this then doth remayne,
When Spaniards are placed, ye muste to newe Spayne.

18. But, oh dreadfull plague, and signe of God's wrothe,
On such noble Gnatos, stronge foes to Gods trothe.
Whom fonde feare hath framed, to prop such a staye,
As countrie and people, so seekth to betraye.

19. Which thinge herein proued, to be with out doute,
All such full well finde shall, as reade it throughout.
Yf then their hartes fayle them the right to defende,
Confusion remayneth for suche a meete end."

Perhaps the reader may be disposed to agree in the quiet, but very pregnant remark which Strype makes after extracting the eighth and three following of these verses: "Such 'treating of the Queen as this was, did, no question, irritate 'her much, and provoke her to issue out such angry declara-'tions of her mind, and resolutions of taking vengeance of 'all such like book-writers or book-readers."[8]

Having, however, learned from Whittingham the authority, and from Kethe "the intent," of Goodman's book, let us come to the book itself, which is of all others the most to our purpose for the first part of the subject, not only because it bears this triple voucher, but because it is written professedly on the general subject of obedience to rulers. Knox was the best man to tell people why they should not obey Queen Mary, but Goodman the best tutor for those who wished conscientiously to obey nobody. Here are some extracts of a general nature;—

[8] Mem. III. ii. 132; where the 8, 9, 10, 11 verses are given. The seven verses which follow are at p. 104 of the same volume. The 8th verse is repeated more correctly in his Ann. II. i. 151; for in the former place it begins, "*Whom* fury." Indeed, whoever compares the above with Strype's quotations will perceive that they have several other corrupt variations. For instance, in v. 9, "right *true* resisting"—in v. 11, "we *will* behold," and "*What* sighs shall *assure* men"—in v. 12, "England doth *treat*"—in v. 13, "*Through* flattery," and "their *head* and vile train"—in v. 15, "yea, unnoble;" beside many minor variations.

"CHAP. VI.

How it is not inough to denye *wicked commandements of all kinde of Rulers, except we* withstand *them also,* euery man *accordinge to his vocation, in* doing the contrary.

"As by this answere afore mentioned, we haue bene taught not to geue place to the vnlawfull commandementes of Magistrates, in what auctoritie so euer they be, because it is nothing but rebellion in the iudgement of God: euen so may we learne by the same answere and example of the Apostles, how God requiereth more at our handes, that is, to *withstande* their preceptes, in doing the contrary: euery man accordinge to his office and estate wherein God hathe placed him."—*Goodman*, p. 63.

"For thogh the Apostle saith: There is no power but of God: yet doth he not here meane anie other powers, but such as are orderly and lawfullie institute of God. Ether els shulde he approue all tyranny and oppression, which cometh to anie common welth by means of wicked and vngodlie Rulers, which are to be called rightlie disorders, and subuersions in common welthes, and not Gods ordinaunce. For he neuer ordeyned anie lawes to approue, but to reproue and punishe tyrantes, idolaters, papistes and oppressors. Then when they are suche, they are not Gods ordinaunce. And in disobeying and resisting such, we do not resiste God's ordinaunce, but Satan and our synne, which is the cause of such. Or els, if we shall so conclude with the wordes of the Apostle, that all powers what so euer they be must be obeyed and not resisted, then must we confesse also, that Satan and all his infernall powers are to be obeyed. Why? because they are powers, and haue their powers also of God, which cannot touche man any farther than God permitteth. But S. Iames geuethe vs, contrarie commandement, saing: Resiste the deuel and he will flee awaye from you."—*Goodman*, p. 110.

"In like case may we conclude of Princes and Magistrats, thogh they be rough and frowarde: yea, thoghe before God they are wicked, vngodlie, and reprobate persons (as was Saule) yet so longe as their wickednesse brasteth not out manifestly agaynst God, and his Lawes, but outwardly will see them obserued and kept of others, punishing the transgressors, and defending the innocent: so longe are we bounde to render vnto such, obedience, as to euill and roughe Maisters: because we may not take Gods office in hande to iudge of the harte any farther then their outwarde deedes do geue manifest testimony. Otherwise, if without feare they transgresse Gods Lawes them selues and commande others to do the like, then haue they lost that honor and obedience which otherwise their subiectes did owe vnto them: and oght no more to be taken for Magistrates but punished as priuate transgressors, as after I haue promised to proue."—*Goodman*, p. 118.

"But where as the kinges or Rulers are become altogether blasphemers of God, and oppressors and murtherers of their subiectes, then oght they to be accompted no more for kinges or lawfull Magistrats, but as priuate men: and to be examined, accused, condemned and punished by the Lawe of God, wherunto

they are and oght to be subiect, and being conuicted and punished by that Lawe, it is not mans, but Gods doing: who as he dothe appoynte such Magistrates ouer his people by his Lawe, so doth he condemne aswel them as the people transgressing agaynste the Lawe. For with God ther is no respecte of persones, as here after folowith more largely."—*Goodman*, p. 139.

"Neither is this ynough, rather to suffer iniurie and losse, then that thou wouldest be a worker of iniurie to others by any means: but more ouer it is thy parte to be a *withstander* of euil, and a supporter of the Godly, to the vttermoste of thy power, as thou hast partly harde all ready, and partly shalt heare now folowing. For as God hath not creadted vs for our selues, but to seke his honor and glorie, and the profit of our neighbour, especially of such as be of the householde of faithe: euen so are we indetted to God, to bestowe all those gyftes, be they spiritual *or corporal*, wherewith God hath blessed vs to the self same end, *stryuing agaynst all impediments, helping, defending, comforting, and deliuering to the vttermoste of our power all such as we are assured do feare God, and stande in nede of our ayde and supporte.* Otherwise we shewe our selues to haue more compassion vpon brute beastes, as our neighbours oxe, asse, or shepe, which Gods Lawe dothe charge vs to helpe, saue, or drawe forthe of the diche, althoghe it were the beaste of our enemie.

"Are we then bound to do this to vnreasonable and brute beastes, yea to any thing belonging to our neighbour, and shall we be afrayde to do the like to him self, what tyme he is in necessitie? Yf his shepe or other of his cattel were readie to be deuoured in our presence of wolues, or suche wilde beastes: are we not bounde as wel in conscience as by the Lawe of God, to driue the wilde beaste awaye and saue his cattel, who can deny this to be our duetie? Can we be excused then in suffringe the soules and bodies of the children of God our brethren, to be moste pitifully distroyed of Gods enemies, by false doctrine and cruel murthering, and *put not to our handes and power to deliuer them?*"—*Goodman*, p. 89.

"You haue synned moste greuouslie agaynst the Lorde: knowe your transgressions, and with teares confesse them, euery man vnfaynedlie vnto the Lorde, who is redie to mercie and slowe to anger. You haue despised an abused the worde of his dearely beloued Sonne Jesus Christ, the Author of saluation, in the dayes of our Godlie kinge Edwarde (which is the cause why God hath thus plaged vs with a tyrant) seke after the worde agayne and receaue it with all reuerence. By geuing auctoritie to an idolatres woman ye haue banished Christe and his Gospell, and in his place restored Antichriste with all his infections, wherin your owne consciences condemne you of euil. Then *in takinge againe the same auctoritie from her, you shall restore Christe and his worde and do well. In obeyinge her, ye haue disobeyed God. Then in disobeying her, ye shall please God.* Because you haue geuen place to her and her counsells, you are all become idolatrous hypocryts, and also traytors to your owne Countrie: then *by resisting her and her wicked decrees, you must*

be made true worshippers of God, and faithfull Englishemen."—Goodman, p. 103.

These extracts may suffice as to the general theory of obedience and disobedience; and the following will illustrate the writer's doctrine as to the source of power, and the duty of those by whom, according to his account, "princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." The beginning of his eleventh chapter is very clear on the subject of the "Sovereignty of the People."

"CHAP. XI.

It apperteyneth not onely to the Magistrates and al other inferior officers to see that their Princes be subiect to Gods Lawes, but to the comon people also: wherby the tyrannie of the Princes and rebellion of the subiects may be auoyded.

"To resiste euill and to mayntayne goodnesse, to honor God truely and to expel idolatrie, euery man will confesse to be a good and godly acte and cannot but highlie commende the workers therof, as men acceptable to God, and worthie members of a comon welthe: but when men consider the daungers and displeasures, which commonly happen to such, then is there great curtesie made who first shall take the enterprise in hand: and longe disputations made whither it be their duetie or no: and to what sortes of men it doth belong, *as thogh any were exempted out of that nomber which do professe the Name of God."—Goodman*, p. 142.

"But *as touching the comon and symple people*, they thinke them selues vtterly discharged, whither their Prince be godlie or vngodlye, wise or foolishe, a preseruer of the comon welthe or ells a distroyer, all is one to them, they muste be obedient, because they are ignorant, and muste be led themselues, not meete to leade others. And because their doinges are counted tumultes and rebellion (except they be agreable to the commandmentes, decrees, and proceadinges of their superior powers and Magistrates, and shal in doing the contrary be as rebells punished) therfore of all others (say they) we haue least to do, yea nothing at all withe the doinges of our Rulers. Yf they rule well, we shall fare the better: if they be vngodly they haue the more to answere for their vngodlinesse. What haue we to do with their matters? Thus do all sortes of men from the highest to the louest slyppe their heades out of the coller: and as careles persones not passing which end goeth forwarde, geueth the brydle wholie to their Rulers till destruction remediles ouerflowe all."—p. 145.

Of the thirteenth chapter it might be sufficient, so far as regards our immediate purpose, to give the title; but it begins with one of those singular admissions which the writers of Goodman's party could not always avoid, and we may as well take it in by the way, for it is very illustrative

of our subject—namely, that the people of the country were not so ready to take part for them, as against them. This is not the place to enter into the subject, but it is worth while to direct the reader's attention to the point.

"CHAP. XIII.

The rednesse of the people to defende idolatrie, superstition, and earthly commodities: and their slouthfulnesse in maynteyning the contrarie. *How they are charged to see the Lawes of God kept, and the transgression of the same punished, if their rulers do neglecte them. And that they may lawfully punish their Magistrates as priuate persones transgressing the Lordes preceptes.*

"Bvt what remedie? (saye you) we being but subiectes with out power, and wisdome cannot helpe it. The more pyttie deare Countriemen, that you haue so stoutly or rather stubbernely shewed your willes and power in the dayes of Godly kynge Edwarde the VI. your late Prince and gouernour, and the zelous seruant of God: who soght to rule you in Gods feare, and vnder whom you had the comfortable worde of God, and were deliuered from the Romishe Antichrist, and from all superstition, for the most parte, hauing your Realme free from strangers, and quiete from all enimies, enioying your goods and freinds in peace with out all force, imprisoning, reuiling, banishing, or murthering.) It is to be lamented (I saye) that then receauing all these blessinges of God, by the means of so worthie a Prince, ye were able to conspire, rise and rebell with the daunger of bodies, goods and soules, agaynst your godlie and lawfull kinge: and that chiefly to defende the deuelishe Masse, and all the puddels of poperie with the Caterpillers and rable of all vncleane spirites, as Cardinalls, Bishopps, Priestes, Monkes, Freers, Nonnes, &c. And now in these matters wherein consisteth the glorie of God, the preseruation of your owne liues, and defence of your countrie you are without all will, power and helpe.

"To restore Antichrisht agayne, whom ons God had banished to all your comfortes, you were not ashamed to terme it obedience, and to count yourselues therin no rebells, but lawfull resisters: but to defende Christe and his confortable Gospell (which then you had in possession) that are you persuaded to be open rebellion. To arme your selues agaynst your superiors, to defend your commons and earthly commodities with holden from you, by the greedy desier of new vpstarte gentlemen, how willing and redie haue you shewed your selues? But to holde and reteyne your spiritual possession not promised onely, but geuen into your handes, you are moste slowe without all hope and courage. Shall not this be to your iuste condemnation? When God calleth you to a rekening, what can you have to answere?"—*Goodman*, p. 175.

The direct reference, and the manner and spirit in which that reference is made to the open rebellions of the former reign, may surprise some readers; but the trio who under-

took to instruct the Christian church on the subject of loyalty, did not mean to mince matters; witness the following defence of Wyat, and lamentation over the miscarriage of his "great Gun" and his rebellion.

"Therefore yf they did well in demandinge succour, and he discharged his conscience in graunting their request, why is it not also lawfull for you to seeke helpe of them that be able and willing: and for them likewise to graute helpe, to whom God hath lente it for that vse especially?

"But I know your answere: experience (saye you) hath taught vs the contrary. For if God had bene pleased herein withe Syr Thomas Wyat that valiant Capitayne taking in hande the like enterprise: it shulde vndoubtedly haue had better successe. But he being a man, and of God, of great estimation amongest all goodmen, was notwithstandinge apprehended, condemned, and at the last (althogh he was promised his pardon) as a traytor beheaded. And besides him Sir Henry Isley knight, with many godely men for the same facte, hanged, and murthered. The like also ye will affirme of that Noble man Henry Lorde Graye, Marques Dorset, and Duke of Suffolke; who onely for the zeale that he had to promote Gods glorie, and the libertie of his countrie, prepared him self with that power he coulde make to the ayde of the sayed Wyat, accordinge to his promisse. But being deceaued, or rather betrayed by such as he trusted vnto, was in the ende also apprehended, and with his brother the Lorde Thomas Gray (a Gentleman of great courage, and towardnesse), likewise beheaded.

"Althogh I minde not to stand long in the praise of these worthye mens factes, who most cowardly were of many betrayed, which since perchance haue felt some parte of worse misery: yet so muche must I nedes confesse in their behalf, that *none but papistes, or traytors can iustly accuse them of treason or disobedience.* Of whom to be misdained or slandered, is in the eyes of the godly, no small commendation, and prayse. For to passe ouer with silence the duke of Suffolke (whose noble parentage and ernest love that he bare to the promoting of Christes Gospell, and the welth of his countrie, is all to Englishe men sufficiently knowne) what I beseche you moued Wyat that worthy knight to rise? Was it his pouertie? Beholde, he was a famous Gentleman of great landes and possessions, stowt and liberall in the seruice of his Prince, faithefull to his countrie, and mercifull to the poore. Soght he ambitiously honour? Which of his enemies coulde herewith iustly charge him? Did he this bicause he was of a troublesome and busy nature, which coulde not be vnder lawfull gouernement. His great wisedome, modestie, and gentle behauiour at all tymes, and to all persons, did well declare the contrary: euer more being founde a faythfull capitayne to his Prince in the fielde, and an obedient subiecte at home. What then moued him to this dangerous entreprise? Verely, the zeale of Gods trueth and the pitie that he had to his Countrie, for the miseries he saw to approche by the vsurped power of vngodly Iesabell, and her merciles papistes the sowldiars of Antichriste. Yf it be treason to defend

the Gospel and his Countrie frome cruel strangers and enemies, then was Wyat a traytor and rebell; but if this was his duetye, and all others that professed Christe amongest you, then are all such traytours, as did deceaue him: and *such at toke not his parte also*, when tyme and occasion by him was justly offered.

"And thogh his enterprise had not such successe, as we woulde haue wisshed: yet was it no worse then our cowardnesse, and vnworthinesse deserued. Whiche nether ought of anie therfore to be condemned, nether shulde be anie discouragement to others in the like. For some tymes we see the verie seruantes of God to haue euill successe in their doinges, according to man's iudgement: and yet God is well pleased therwith. As the example of the Israelites, wherof we made mention before dothe moste manifestlie approue: at what tyme they armed them selues agaynst the Beniamites, and that at the commandement of God, and yet were twise disconcfyted, losing the first tyme 22. thousand men: and the next day folowing 18. thowsand: bothe tymes, consulting with the Lorde, and folowing his commandement."—*Goodman*, p. 201.

Whether this affords ground for supposing that Goodman was in Wyat's rebellion, I do not know; but it naturally reminds one of Ponet, aud a few words from him may be quite in place, though they are too much in the same strain to afford much variety.

"If nature, reason, honestie and lawe dothe so greviously punishe him, and cast him out of all honest mennes companies, that is negligent in a trifle, how muche more ought he to be punished and cast out of all mennes sight, that is necligent in the greatest matiers? If he ought so sharpely to be vsed, that deceaueth one poore man, how much more sharpely ought he to be punished, and of all men to be abhorred (yea *cast to the dogges*) that deceaueth a hole realme of ten or twentie hundred thousaunt persones? If he be thus to be abhorred and punished, that is required to doo an other mannes busynesse, and deceaueth him, how muche more ought they to be abhorred and hated that take vpon them to doo for others not desired but suying for it, not called thereto but thrusting in themself, not prayed but payeing, geuing many lyuereyes, procuring and making frendes to geue them their uoices, obteynying of great mennes lettres, and ladies tokens, feasting freeholders, and making great banketting cheare, not by the consent of the parte, but by force and streinght, with tropes of horsemen, billes, bowes, pykes, gonnes, and such like kynde of qualityes."—*Ponet*, Sig. A vii. *b*.

Surely Ponet had forgotten the great "gonne"; or else he thought that such things were lawful on one side only. He gives indeed a hint in one place, as if he thought that practices generally esteemed more discreditable than "great Guns" in broad daylight, might be lawfully used for the removal of obnoxious persons. At least I know not what was the meaning of continually picking out scraps of history,

unless these writers expected and intended every man to be his own Croxall and moralize forth the inference, "We see by this story that when a man is a very wicked man, it is a good thing to go and kill him." There are too many such passages; and one, though somewhat out of place, may be here given as a specimen. As to Caligula;—

"Many other noble actes by his absolute power he wrought: and at leynght he commaunded that his ymage should be set vp in the temple at Ierusalem, and ther worshipped: as not vnlike Saint Gardiners (for he hathe done no smal thinges) shalbe shortly by Anticipacion in England. But what was thende of Caligulaes absolute power? whan he had reigned three yeares and ten monethes, his owne householde seruauntes conspired against hym, and the general of his owne Armie slewe him."—*Ponet*, Sig. B vii. *b*.

I must add another from Goodman, which regards the general subject, because there is something about it which to those who would be likely to receive and be influenced by it at the time, might appear argumentative and scriptural, and my object (I trust I have shown it by the length of these extracts) is not to catch at a hasty expression, or make any man an offender for a word, but to show what was the doctrine quietly and carefully taught by those who were accredited as teachers by their party.

"The like commandement is also geuen in the 17. and 18. Chap. of the same boke [Deuteronomy] charging all the people of God in generall, to see idolatrie punished without mercie, and that in all persones. Wherefore we may moste certaynely conclude, that if the Rulers and Magistrates in this case, woulde not execute the Lawes of God where with they are so straightly charged, that then the people are not discharged, excepte *they put it in execution* to take the euil from amongest them, to whom it also belongeth.

"Next, that no persone is exempted by any Lawe of God from this punishment, be he kinge, Quene or Emperour, that is, either openly or priuely knowne to be an idolatrer be he neuer so neare or deare vnto vs, he must dye the death. For God hath not placed them aboue others to transgresse his Lawes as they liste, but to be subiecte vnto them as well as others, ouer whom they gouerne.

"And if they be subiecte vnto his Lawes, they muste be subiect to the punishment also, when they be fownd disobedient transgressors: yea, so muche the more as their example is more daungerous. For looke what wickednesse reigneth in the Magistrates, the subiectes comonly take incouragement therby to imitate the same, as we see in the examples of Iereboam, Achab and wicked Manasses, who being suffred in the beginninge to commit idolatrie, and to erecte idoles, made the same likewise lawfull to all their subiectes. For the same cause God commanded Moyses to hange vp all the capitaynes and heads of the people, for that by their example

they made the people idolatrers also: he had no respect to their auctocitie, because they were Rulers, but so muche the rather woulde he haue them so sharplie punished, that is, hanged agaynst the sunne without mercy: which iudgement, thoghe it was done at Gods commandment firste, and after at Moyses, yet were the people executors of the same, and all did vnderstand that it was iuste: and not for that tyme onely, but to be *a perpetuall example for euer*, and a *sure admonition of their duetie* in the like defection from God, *to hange vp such Rulers* as shulde drawe them from him.

"And thoghe it appeare at the firste sight a great disordre, that the people shulde take vnto them the punishment of transgression, yet when the Magistrates and other officers cease to do their duetie, they are as it were, without officers, yea, worse then if they had none at all and then God geueth the sworde in to the peoples hande, and he him selfe is become immedialty their head (Yf they will seeke the accomplishment of his Lawes) and hath promised to defend them and blesse them."—*Goodman*, p. 183.

Perhaps I have given the reader sufficient materials for judging how the doctrine of loyalty and rebellion in general was treated by puritan writers; and we may proceed to what more particularly concerns Queen Mary personally, and her government in particular.

ESSAY VII.

PURITAN POLITICS. No. III.

RESPECTING QUEEN MARY IN PARTICULAR.

KNOX—GOODMAN—TRAHERON—PONET—BECON.

JOHN KNOX and Christopher Goodman, as has been already stated, are the two great authorities with regard to puritan politics during the reign of Queen Mary. They laid down the law very plainly; and I am not aware that, while that unhappy monarch lived, any one of the exiled party offered one word in contradiction, qualification, or explanation of the fierce regicidal libels of those two writers.

As to Goodman, I hope that the reader has been enabled by the preceding paper to form some opinion of his doctrine on the subject of loyalty, and obedience to authority, in general. That doctrine was applied with ferocious zeal to

the particular case of the Sovereign of England and her subjects, by Knox, who insisted principally on three points;—First, that Queen Mary was a woman, and as such a creature under the curse of God. Secondly, that she was illegitimate, and therefore an usurper. Thirdly, that waiving the question of her sex and birth, and supposing for the sake of argument that she had come fairly to the throne, yet she had shown herself to be a tyrant, and ought to be crushed like a viper. These points cannot always be kept separate in discussion; but they will show themselves plainly enough in passages which will be laid before the reader.

Knox, indeed, comes to the point at once by beginning his "Blast" with these words:—

"Wonder it is, that amongest so many pregnant wittes as the Ile of greate Brittany hath produced, so many godlie and zelous preachers as England did sometime norishe, and amongest so many learned and men of graue iudgement, as this day by IESABEL are exiled, none is found so stowte of courage, so faithfull to God, nor louing to their natiue countrie, that they dare admonishe the inhabitantes of that Ile how abominable before God, is the Empire or Rule of *a wicked woman, yea of a traiteresse and bastard;* and what may a people or nation left destitute of a lawfull head, do by the authoritie of Goddes worde in electing and appointing common rulers and magistrates. That Ile (alas) for the contempt and horrible abuse of Goddes mercies offred, and for the shamefull reuolting to Satan frome Christ Iesus, and frome his Gospell ones professed, doth iustlie merite to be left in the handes of their own counsel, and so to come to confusion and bondage of strangiers.

"But yet I feare that this vniuersal negligence of such as sometimes were esteemed watchemen, shall rather aggrauate our former ingratitude, than excuse this our vniuersall and vngodlie silence, in so weightie a mater. We se our countrie set furthe for a pray to foreine nations; we heare the blood of our brethren, the membres of Christ Iesus, most cruellie to be shed; and *the monstruous empire of a cruell woman* (the secrete counsel of God excepted) *we knowe to be the onlie occasion of all these miseries:* and yet with silence we passe the time as thogh the mater did nothinge appertein to vs. But the contrarie examples of the auncient prophetes moue me to doubte of this our fact. For Israel did vniuersalie decline frome God by embrasing idolatrie vnder Ieroboam. In whiche they did continue euen vnto the destruction of their common welthe. And Iuda withe Ierusalem did followe the vile superstition and open iniquitie of Samaria. But yet ceased not the prophetes of God to admonishe the one and the other. Yea, euen after that God had poured furthe his plagues vpon them. For Ieremie did write to the captiues in Babylon, and did correct their errors, plainlie instructing them, who did remaine in the middest of that idolatrouse nation. Ezechiel frome the middest of his brethren prisoners in Chaldea, did write

his vision to those that were in Ierusalem, and sharplie rebukinge their vices, assured them that they shuld not escape the vengeance of God by reason of their abominations committed.

"The same prophetes for comfort of the afflicted and chosen saintes of God, who did lie hyd amongest the reprobate of that age (as commonlie doth the corne amongest the chaffe) did prophecie, and before speake, the changes of kingdomes, the punishmentes of tyrannes, and the vengeance whiche God wold execute vpon the oppressors of his people. The same did Daniel and the rest of the prophetes euerie one in their season. By whose examples and by the plaine precept, which is geuen to Ezechiel, commanding him that he shall say to the wicked, 'Thou shalt die the death,' we in this our miserable age are bounde to admonishe the world and the tyrannes therof, of their sodeine destruction; to assure them, and to crie vnto them, whether they list to heare or not, that the blood of the saintes, which by them is shed, continuallie crieth and craueth vengeance in the presence of the Lorde of hostes.

"And further, it is our dutie to open the truthe reueled vnto vs, vnto the ignorant and blind world, vnlest that to our owne condemnation we list to wrap vp and hyde the talent committed to our charge. *I am assured that God hath reueled to some in this our age, that it is more then a monstre in nature, that a woman shall reigne and haue empire aboue man.* And yet with vs all, there is suche silence, as if God there with were nothing offended. The naturall man, ennemy to God shall fynd, I knowe, many causes why no suche doctrine ought to be published in these our dangerous dayes. First, for that it may seme to tend to sedition: secondarilie it shal be dangerous not onlie to the writer or publisher, but also to all such as shall reade the writinges, or fauor this truth spoken: and last it shall not amend the chief offenders, partlie because it shall neuer come to their eares, and partlie because they will not be admonished in such cases."

How he pursued the subject thus broadly opened will appear from the following extracts;—

"Yf any think that the empire of women, is not of such importance, that for the suppressing of the same, any man is bounde to hazarde his life, I answer, that to suppresse it, is in the hand of god alone. But to vtter the impiety and abomination of the same, I say, it is the dutie of euerie true messager of God, to whome the truth is reueled in that behalfe. For the especiall dutie of Goddes messagers is to preache repentance, to admonishe the offenders of their offenses, and to say to the wicked, 'thou shalt die the death,' except thou repent. This, I trust, will no man denie to be the propre office of all Goddes messagers, to preache (as I have said) repentance and remission of synnes. But nether of both can be done, except the conscience of the offenders be accused and conuicted of transgression. For howe shall any man repent not knowing wherein he hath offended? And where no repentance is founde, there can be no entrie to grace. And therfore I say, that of necessitie it is that this monstriferouse empire of women (which amongest all enor-

mities, that this day do abound vpon the face of the hole earth, is most detestable and damnable) be openlie reueled and plainlie declared to the world, to the end that some may repent and be saued. And thus farre to the first sorte."—*Knox*, Pref. p. 5.

"To promote a woman to beare rule, superioritie, dominion or empire aboue any realme, nation, or citie, is repugnant to nature, contumelie to God, a thing most contrarious to his reuelled will and approued ordinance, and finallie it is the subuersion of good order, of all equitie and iustice."—*Knox*, p. 9.

"But now to the second part of nature: In the whiche I include the reueled will and perfect ordinance of God, and against this parte of nature, I say, that it doth manifestlie repugne that any woman shal reigne or beare dominion ouer man. For God first by the order of his creation, and after by the curse and malediction pronounced against the woman, by reason of her rebellion, hath pronounced the contrarie.

"First, I say that women in her greatest perfection, was made to serue and obey man, not to rule and command him: As saint Paule doth reason in these wordes: Man is not of the woman but the woman of the man. And man was not created for the cause of the woman, but the woman for the cause of man, and therfore oght the woman to haue a power vpon her head (that is a couerture in signe of subiection). Of whiche words it is plaine that the Apostle meaneth, that woman in her greatest perfection shuld haue knowen, that man was Lord aboue her: and therfore that she shulde neuer haue pretended any kind of superioritie aboue him, no more then do the angels aboue God the creater, or aboue Christ Jesus their head. So, I say, that in her greatest perfection woman was created to be subiect to man.

"But after her fall and rebellion committed against God, there was put vpon her a newe necessitie, and she was made subiect to man by the irreuocable sentence of God, pronounced in these wordes: I will greatlie multiplie thy sorowe and thy conception. With sorow shalt thou beare thy children, and thy will shall be subiect to thy man: and he shal beare dominion ouer the. Herebie may such as altogither be not blinded plainlie see, that God, by his sentence, hath deiected all woman from empire and dominion aboue man. For two punishmentes are laid vpon her, to witte, a dolor, anguishe and payn, as oft as euer she shal be mother: and a subiection of her selfe, her appetites and will, to her husband, and to his will. Frome the former part of this malediction can nether arte, nobilitie, policie, nor lawe made by man, deliuer womankinde, but who soeuer atteineth to that honour to be mother, proueth in experience the effect and strength of goddes word. But (alas) ignorance of God, ambition, and tyrannie haue studied to abolishe and destroy the second parte of Goddes punishment. For women are lifted vp to be heades ouer realmes, and to rule aboue men at their pleasure and appetites. But *horrible is the vengeance, which is prepared for the one and for the other*, for the *promoters*, and for the persones *promoted*, except they speedilie repent. For they shall be deiected from the glorie of the sonnes of God, to the sclauerie of the deuill, and to the tor-

ment that is prepared for all suche, as do exalte themselves against God.

"Against God can nothing be more manifest, than that a woman shall be exalted to reigne aboue man. For the contrarie sentence hath he pronounced in these wordes: Thy will shall be subiect to thy husband, and he shall beare dominion ouer the. As God shuld say: forasmuch as thou hast abused thy former condition, and because thy free will hath broght thy selfe and mankind into the bondage of Satan, I therfore will bring the in bondage to man. For where before, thy obedience shuld haue bene voluntarie, nowe it shall be by constreint and by necessitie: and that because thou hast deceived thy man, thou shalt therfore be no longar maistresse ouer thine own appetites, ouer thine owne will nor desires. For in the there is nether reason nor discretion, whiche be able to moderate thy affections, and therfore they shall be subiect to the desire of thy man. He shall be Lord and gouernour, not onlie ouer thy bodie, but euen ouer thy appetites and will.

"This sentence, I say, did God pronounce against Heua and her daughters, as the rest of the Scriptures doth euidentlie witnesse. So that no woman can euer presume to reigne aboue man, but the same she must nedes do *in despite of God, and in contempt of his punishment and malediction.*"—Knox, p. 15.

"For who wolde not iudge that bodie to be a monstre, where there was no head eminent aboue the rest, but that the eyes were in the handes, the tonge and mouth beneth in the belie, and the eares in the feet. Men, I say, shulde not onlie pronounce this bodie to be a monstre: but assuredlie they might conclude that such a bodie coulde not long indure. And no lesse monstruous is the bodie of that common welth, where a woman beareth empire. For ether doth it lack a laufull heade (as in very dede it doth) or els there is an idol exalted in the place of the true head. An idol I call that, which hath the forme and apparance, but lacketh the vertue and strength, which the name and proportion do resemble and promise. As images haue face, nose, eyes, mouth, handes, and feet painted, but the vse of the same, can not the craft and art of man geue them: as the holy ghost by the mouth of Dauid teacheth vs, saying: they haue eyes, but they see not, mouth, but they speake not, nose, but they smell not, handes and feet, but they neither touche nor haue power to go.

"And suche, I say, is euerie realme and nation, where a woman beareth dominion. For in *despite of God* (he of his iust iudgement, so *geuing them ouer in to a reprobat minde*) may a realme, I confesse, exalt vp a woman to that monstriferous honor, to be estemed as head. But impossible it is to man and angel, to geue vnto her the properties and perfect offices of a laufull heade. For the same God that hath denied power to the hand to speake, to the bely to heare, and to the feet to see, hath denied to woman power to commande man, and hath taken away wisdome to consider, and prouidence to forsee the thinges that be profitable to the common welth: yea finallie he hath denied to her in any case to be head to man: but plainly hath pronounced that man is head to woman, euen as Christ

is heade to all man. If men in a blinde rage shulde assemble to gether, and apointe them selues an other heade then Jesus Christ, (as the papistes haue done their romishe Antichrist) shuld Christ therfore lose his owne dignitie, or shulde God geue to that counterfet head power to geve life to the bodie, to see what soeuer might endamage or hurte it, to speake in defense, and to heare the request of euerie subject? It is certein that he wold not. For that honor he hath apointed before all times to his onlie sonne: and the same will he geue to no creature besides: no more will he admit, nor accept woman to be the lauful head ouer man, although man, deuil, and angel will coniure in their fauor."—p. 27.

"For nature hath in all beastes printed a certeine marke of dominion in the male, and a certeine subiection in the female, whiche they kepe inuiolate. For no man euer sawe the lion make obedience, and stoupe before the lionesse, nether yet can it be proued, that the hinde taketh the conducting of the heard amongest the hartes. And yet (alas) man, who by the mouth of God hath dominion apointed to him ouer woman, doth not onlie to his own shame, stoupe vnder the obedience of women, but also in despit of God and of his apointed ordre, reioyseth, and mainteineth that monstruouse authoritie, as a thing lauful and iust."—p. 30.

"Albeit I haue thus (talkinge with my God in the anguishe of my harte) some what digressed: yet haue I not vtterlie forgotten my former proposition, to witt, that *it is a thing repugnant to the ordre of nature*, that any woman be exalted to rule ouer men. For God hath denied vnto her the office of a head. And in the intreating of this parte, I remembre that I haue made the nobilitie both of England and Scotland inferior to brute beastes for what they do to women, which no male amongest the common sorte of beastes can be proued to do to their females: that is, they reuerence them, and qwake at their presence, they obey their commandementes, and that against God. Wherfore I iudge them not onelie subiectes to women, but sclaues of Satan, and seruantes of iniquitie. If any man thinke these my wordes sharpe or vehement, let him consider that the offense is more haynous, then can be expressed by wordes. For where all thinges, be expressedly concluded against the glorie and honor of God, and where the blood of the saintes of God is commanded to be shed, whome shall we iudge, God or the deuil, to be president of that counsel?"—p. 32.

The hint thus given to the Queen's Council must not be passed over without remark. It is, of course, highly important to notice it in an inquiry which turns so much on the question how far the proceedings of the government at home was influenced by the conduct of parties abroad. The idea is elsewhere repeated and amplified by Knox;—

"For that woman reigneth aboue man, she hath obteined it *by treason and conspiracie* committed against God. Howe can it be

then, that she being criminall and giltie of treason against God committed, can apointe any officer pleasing in his sight? It is a thing impossible. Wherefore *let men that receiue of women authoritie, honor or office*, be most assuredly persuaded, that in so mainteining that vsurped power, they declare themselues ennemies to God. If any thinke, that because the realme and estates therof, haue geuen their consentes to a woman, and haue established her, and her authoritie: that therfore it is laufull and acceptable before God: let the same men remember what I haue said before, to wit, that God can not approve the doing nor consent of any multitude, concluding any thing against his worde and ordinance, and therfore they must haue a more assured defense against the wrath of God, then the approbation and consent of a blinded multitude, or elles they shall not be able to stand in the presence of the consuming fier: that is, *they must acknowledge that the regiment of a woman is a thing most odious in the presence of God. They must refuse to be her officers, because she is a traitoresse and rebell against God.* And finallie they must studie *to represse her inordinate pride and tyrannie to the vttermost of their power.*

"The same is the dutie of *the nobilitie and estates*, by whose blindnes a woman is promoted. First in so farre, as they haue most haynouslie offended against God, placing in authoritie suche as God by his worde hath remoued frome the same, vnfeinedly they ought to call for mercie, and being admonished of their error and damnable fact, in signe and token of true repentance, with common consent they ought to retreate that, which vnaduisedlie and by ignorance they haue pronounced, and *ought without further delay to remoue from authority all such persones, as by vsurpation, violence, or tyrannie, do possesse the same.*

"For *so did Israel and Iuda* after they reuolted from Dauid, and Iuda alone in the dayes of Athalia. For after that she by murthering her sonnes children, had obteined the empire ouer the land, and had most vnhappelie reigned in Iuda six years, Iehoiada the high priest called together the capitaines and chief rulers of the people, and shewing to them the kinges sonne Ioas, did binde them by an othe *to depose that wicked woman*, and to promote the king to his royall seat, whiche they faithfullie did, *killinge* at his commandement not onlie *that cruel and mischeuous woman*, but also the people did destroie the temple of Baal, break his altars and images, and kill Mathan Baales high priest before his altars.

"The same is the dutie as well of the estates, as of the people that hath bene blinded.

"First *they ought to remoue frome honor and authoritie, that monstre in nature* (so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea a woman against nature reigning aboue man).

"Secondarilie if any presume to defende that impietie, *they ought not to feare, first to pronounce, and then after to execute against them the sentence of deathe.* If any man be affraid to violat the oth of obedience, which they haue made to suche monstres, let them be most assuredly persuaded, that as the beginning of their othes, proceding from ignorance was sinne, so is the obstinate purpose to kepe the same, nothinge but plaine rebellion against God. But of this

mater in the second blast, God willing, we shall speake more at large."—p. 52.

"Cursed Iesabel of England, with the pestilent and detestable generation of papistes, make no litle bragge and boast, that they haue triumphed not only against Wyet, but also against all such as haue entreprised any thing against them or their procedinges. But let her and them consider, that yet they haue not preuailed against god, his throne is more high, then that the length of their hornes be able to reache. And let them further consider, that in the beginning of this their bloodie reigne, the haruest of their iniquitie was not comen to full maturitie and ripenes. No, it was so grene, so secret I meane, so couered, and so hid with hypocrisie, that some men (euen the seruantes of God) thoght it not impossible, but that wolues might be changed in to lambes, and also that the vipere might remoue her natural venom. But God, who doth reuele in his time apointed, the secretes of hartes, and that will haue his iudgemetes iustified euen by the verie wicked, hath now geuen open testimonie of her and their beastlie crueltie. For man and woman, learned and vnlearned, nobles and men of baser sorte, aged fathers and tendre damiselles, and finailie the bones of the dead, aswell women as men haue tasted of their tyrannie, so that now not onlie the blood of father Latimer, of the milde man of God the bishop of Cantorburie, of learned and discrete Ridley, of innocent ladie Iane dudley, and many godly and worthie preachers, that cannot be forgotten, such as fier hath consumed, and the sworde of tyrannie most vniustlie hath shed, doth call for vengeance in the eares of the Lord God of hostes: but also the sobbes and teares of the poore oppressed, the groninges of the angeles, the watchmen of the Lord, yea and euerie earthlie creature abused by their tyrannie do continuallie crie and call for the hastie execution of the same. I feare not to say, that the *day of vengeance, whiche shall apprehend that horrible monstre Iesabel of Englande, and suche as maintein her monstruous crueltie, is alredie apointed in the counsel of the Eternall: and I verelie beleue that it is so nigh, that she shall not reigne so long in tyrannie, as hitherto she hath done, when God shall declare himselfe to be her ennemie*, when he shall poure furth contempt vpon her, according to her crueltie, and shal kindle the hartes of such, as somtimes did fauor her with deadly hatred against her, that they may *execute his iudgementes*. And therfore let such as assist her, take 'hede what they do."—p. 55.

On this point, too, Goodman and Traheron were equally explicit;—

"The counsellers, whose office is to brydle the affections of their Princes and Gouuernours, in g'uing such counsele as might promote the glorie of God, and the welthe of their contrie, by this persuasion of obedience, haue hitherto sought, and yet apearinglie do, how to accomplishe and satisfie the vngodly lustes of their vngodlie and vnlawful Gouernesse, wicked IESABEL: who for our synnes, contrarie to nature and the manyfeste worde of God, is suffred to raigne ouer vs in Goddes furie, and haue therby moste wickedlie betrayed

Christe, their countrie, and themselues (so muche as lieth in them) to become slaues to a strange and foren nation, the prowde Spaniards."—*Goodman*, p. 33.

"Turne thyne eyes now to thy counsel England, how fierce tygres, how cruel wolues, how rauening beares, how lecherous goates, how wilie foxes, or to speake plainly without figure, what periured traitors to god, and to the, what murderers, what oppressors of the poore, what voluptuous Sardanapales, what adulterers, how vile flatterers shalt thou finde amonge them? It were a smal faulte, and a verie peccadulia in them to dissemble the truth of religion. Thei raile vpon it, they tosse it with scoffes and mockes, they bloodely, and tyrannously persequute it. It might be wincked at, if thei toke bribes, only to oppresse the cause of a few poore men, thei take bribes to betraie the hole realme. It might be passed ouer with silence if thei had murdered but one man a peece, the blood of innumerable sainctes crieth vp to heauen against them and the groninges of manie thousandes oppressed ar heard euerie where. It might perchaunce be perdoned, if they spent but some weekes in pleasures, they wallow continually in vile voluptuousnes, and wanton daliance, and waste al their vnhappie daies in beastlie delites, nether can chaunge of women, nor women only satisfie their filthie abominable desires. Breifely there be no vices in the world whereof you maie not see great buddes, or rather great bounnies, and bunches in them. Here I maie not lette scape the pristes of Calece, a foule broode of thy henne. Papistes they were," &c.—*Traheron's Warning to England*, (see before p. 84.)

To return, however, to what is more precisely our present subject—the treatment which the Queen herself met with from these parties—perhaps enough has been given from Knox, and it may be time to enforce his doctrine by one or two extracts from his friend Goodman.

"The nexte rule to be obserued is, that he shulde be one of their *brethern*, meaninge of the Israelits: partlie to exclude the oppression and idolatrie, whiche commeth in by strangers, as our contrie now is an example: and partlye, for that strangers cannot beare such a natural zeale to straunge realmes and peoples, as becomethe brethern: but *chieflie* to auoyde that *monster in nature, and disordre amongest men, whiche is the Empire and gouernement of a woman*, sayinge expreslie: From the myddle of thy *brethren* shalt thou chose thee a kinge, and not amongist thy *sisters*. For God is not contrairie to himselfe, whiche at the begynninge appoynted the woman to be in subiection to her housbande, and the man to be head of the woman (as saithe the Apostle) who wil not permitte so muche to the woman, as to speake in the Assemblie of men, muche lesse to be Ruler of a Realme or nation. Yf women be not permitted by Ciuile policies to rule in inferior offices, to be Counsellours, Pears of a realme, Iustices, Shireffs, Baylieus and such like: I make your selues iudges, whither it be mete for them to gouerne whole Realmes and nations?

"If the worde of God can not persuade you, by which she is made subiect to her housbande, muche more to the Counselle and auctoritie of an whole realme, which worde also appoynteth your kinges to be chosen from amonge their brethern, and not from their sisters, who are forbidden as persons vnmete to speake in a congregacion, be you your selues iudges, and let nature teache you the absurditie therof.

"And thus muche haue I of pourpose noted in this matter, to let you see to all our shames, how farre you haue bene led besydes your commun senses and the manifest worde of God, in electing, anoynting, and crowninge *a woman* to be your Quene and Gouernesse, *and she in verie dede a bastarde, and vnlawfully begotten.* But be it that she were no bastarde, but the kinges daughter as lawfullie begotten as was her sister, that Godlie Lady, and meke Lambe, voyde of all Spanishe pride, and strange bloude: yet in the sicknesse, and at the deathe of our lawfull Prince of Godlie memorie kynge Edwarde the sixt, this shulde not haue bene your firste counsele or question, who shulde be your Quene, what woman you shulde crowne, if you had bene preferrers of Goddes glorie, and wise counselours, or naturallie affected towardes your countrie. But firste and principallie, who had bene moste meetest amengest your brethern to haue had the gouernement ouer you, and the whole gouernement of the realme, to rule them carefullie, in the feare of God, and to preserue them agaynst all oppression of inwarde tyrants and outwarde enemies. Wher bie you might haue bene assured to eskape all this miserable and vnspeakable disordre, and shamefull confusion, whiche now by contrarie counsele is broght worthely vpon vs."—*Goodman*, p. 51.

"That wicked woman, whom you vntruely make your Quene, hath (saye ye) so commanded. O vayne and miserable men. To what vilenesse are you broght, and yet as men blynd, see not? Because you would not haue God to raigne ouer you, and his worde to be a light vnto your footestepps, beholde, he hath not geuen an hypocrite onely to raigne ouer you (as he promised) but an Idolatresse also: *not a man accordinge to his appoyntment, but a woman, which his Lawe forbiddeth, and nature abhorreth:* whose reigne was neuer counted lawfull by the worde of God, but an expresse signe of Gods wrathe, and notable plague for the synnes of the people. As was the raygne of cruell Iesabel, and vngodlie Athalia, especiall instrumentes of Satan, and whipps to his people of Israel.

"This you see not, blynded with ignorance: yea, whiche is more shame, where as the worde of God freethe you from the obedience of anie Prince, be he neuer so mightie, wise, or politike commanding anye thinge whiche God forbiddeth, and herein geuethe you auctoritie to withstand the same as you haue harde: Yet are you willingly become as it were bondemen to the lustes of *a most impotent and vnbrydled woman; a woman begotten in adulterie a bastard by birth, contrarie to the worde of God and your owne lawes.* And therfore condemned as a bastarde by the iudgement of all vniuersities in Englande, France, and Italy: as well of the Ciuilians, as Diuines. For now are we freede from that Ieweshe yoke to

rayse up seede to our brethern departing without issue, by the comynge of our Sauiour Iesus Christe, who hathe destroyed the walle and distance betwixt the Iewes and Gentiles, and hathe no more respecte to anie tribes (for conseruation wherof this was permitted) but all are made one in him with out distinction, which acknowledge him vnfaynedlie to be the Sonne of God and Sauiour of the worlde. For in Christe Iesus there is nether Iewe nor Gentile, Grecian or Barbarous, bonde nor free, &c. And therfore it must nedes followe, that kinge Henrie the eight, in marying with his brothers wife, did vtterly contemne the free grace of our Sauiour Iesus Christe, which longe before had deliuered vs from the seruitude of that lawe: and also committed adulterous incest contrary to the worde of God, when he begate *this vngodlie serpent Marie, the chief instrument of all this present miserie in Englande.*

"And if any would saie, it was of a zele to fulfyll the lawe which then was abrogated, he must confesse also that the kinge did not marie of carnall luste, but to rayse vp seede to his brother: when the contrarie is well knowne to all men. Let no man therfore be offended, that I call her by her propre name, a bastarde, and vnlawfully begotten: seeing the worde of God, which cannot lye, doth geue witnesse vpon my parte. And moreouer, that suche as are bastardes shulde be *depriued of all honor:* in so muche as by the Lawe of Moyses they were prohibited to haue entrance in to the Congregation or assembly of the Lorde to the tenth generation. Consider then your vngodlie proceadings in defrawding your contrie of a lawfull kinge: and preferringe a bastarde to the lawful begotten dawghter, and exaltinge her whiche is, and will be a common plague and euersion of altogether: for as much as she is a traytor to God, and promis breaker to her dearest frindes, who helpinge her to their power to her vnlawfull reigne, were promised to inioye that religion which was preached vnder kinge Edwarde: which not withstanding in a shorte space after, she most falsely ouerthrewe and abolished. So that now both by Gods Lawes and mans, *she ought to be punished with death,* as an open idolatres in the sight of God, and a cruel murtherer of his Saints before men, and merciles traytoresse to her owne natiue countrie."—*Ponet*, p. 96.

"If your IESABELL, thoghe she be an *vnlawfull Gournesse, and ought not by Gods word and your owne lawes to rule,* would seke your peace and protection as did Nabuchadnezer to his captiues the Iewes: then might you haue some pretence to follow Ieremies counselle: that is, to be quiete, and praye for her liffe, if she would confesse the onelie God of the Christians, and not compell you to idolatrie no more than did Nabuchadnezer: who acknowledged the God of the Iewes to be the true and euerlasting God, and gaue the same commandement throughout all his dominions, That what soeuer people or nation spake euill of the God of Israell shuld be rent in pieces, and his howse counted detestable. For (saithe he) Ther is no other true God that so coulde deliuer his seruantes, as he did Sidrach Misach and Abdenago.

"But because her doinges tend all to the contrarie, that is to

blaspheme God, and also compell all others to do the like, what cloke haue you here *to permitte this wickednesse?*

"To be shorte, if she at the burninge of three hundreth Martyrs at the leste, could haue bene satisfied and vnfaynedly moued to confesse the true Christe and Messias, and repented her former rebellion in geuing contrarie commandement to all her dominions, charging them to receaue agayne the true religion and to expell all blasphemous idolatrie of the pestilent papistes: and that none shulde speake any euill agaynst Christe and his Religion (as did Nabuchadnezer by the example of three persons onely, whom the fire by the power of God coulde not touche) then were she more to be borne with, and reuerenced as a Ruler (*if it were lawfull for a woman to rule at all*) then were there also some probabilitie in the reasons of the aduersaries of this doctrine. Otherwise as you now see, it maketh nothing at all for their purpose."—*Goodman*, p. 130.

I am not singular in viewing Knox and Goodman as the chief political guides of their party. They were so considered (and with very good reason) in their own time, not only by their own friends, but by their Romish enemies; and, to give one instance, they have been very particularly and pleasantly set forth as such in "An Oration against the 'Unlawfull Insurrections of the Protestantes of our time, 'vnder pretence to Refourme Religion ¶ made and pro-'nounced in Latin, in the Schole of Artes at Louaine, the 'xiiij of December. Anno 1565. ¶ By Peter Frarin of 'Andwerp, M. of Arte, and Bacheler of both lawes. And 'now translated into English, with the aduise of the 'Author."[1] The book has one peculiarity for which it deserves to be noticed; and for which, I presume, it is indebted to the translator. I mean, "The Table of this Booke 'set ovt not by order of Alphabete or numbre but by ex-'presse figure, to the eye and sight of the Christian Reader, 'and of him also that cannot reade." In fact it has a sort of pictorial index, each page of which contains two cuts having

[1] In the prefatory epistle from "The Translatour to the Gentle Reader" we are informed that;—"Among many other laudable customes 'of the noble Vniuersitie of Louaine, this one is yearely observed there, 'that in the moneth of December al ordinarie lessons cease for the space 'of one whole weeke, and in place thereof some Learned man is chosen 'by common assent to be the President of certaine disputations: wherein 'he propoueth, to such as are thereto appointed, diuerse frutefull ques-'tions in Diuinitie, Law, Physick, Phylosophie, Humanitie, and in all 'probable matters," &c. The translation was printed by John Fouler, Antwerp, 1566, 8vo; and from his signature to the letter above mentioned it would seem as if he was also the translator.

underneath them respectively references to the signature of the page of the book in which the subject which they represent is treated of, and two or more verses describing it. One of these cuts is so much to our purpose that I cannot help offering the reader a facsimile.

E vi. If it

No Queene in her kingdome can or ought
to syt fast
If Knokes or Goodmans bookes blowe
any true blast.

Few readers will, I suppose, dispute the truth of this poetical statement; or wonder that Mr. Peter Frarin included the "Gospellers of England" among the insurgent protestants who were the subject of his oration.

"I could," he says, "declare vnto you, how the traiterouse Gospellers of England gathered a maine hoste againste their moste vertuouse ladie Queen Marie the rare treasure the peerlesse Jewell, the most perfecte paterne and Example of our daies. How they shotte arrowes and dartes againste her Courte gates, conspired her death, deuised to poison her, to kil her with a dagge at one time, with a priuie dagger at an other time, reuiled her, called her bastard, boutcher, printed seditiouse bokes againste her, wherein they railed at her like Hellhoundes, and named her traiterouse Marie, mischeuouse Marie."—*Sig.* E. vi.

The reader will guess the parts of this extract which bear the marginal notes "Wiate's Rebellion" and "Knokes boke." Indeed Mr. Peter Frarin seems to have had good information on the former of these points, and some phrases sound as if he had heard the report of the "great gun;" for instance;—

"Your purpose was, ye say, to refourme the christian faith. How then? When you could not therein preuail, nor perswade the people, that was somewhat stubborn and stiffnecked perhaps as you iudged, did you think it the best way by & by with gonne shot and bytels to beat and driue the faith into their heades?"—*Sig.* B. vi.

"O master ministers, it is a very harde word that ye bring vs, for ye speake gonnestones, your gospel is to hot, ye preache fire and powder, your religion is to cruel, it breedeth bloud and murder."—*Sig.* C. v.

"Ye travailed to bring the world to your Religion by villany, railing, and dubble cannons."—*Sig.* C. vij. *b.*

If there be any who think this strong language they will perhaps feel it difficult to answer the orator when he more dispassionately asks "Was it meete that because they could 'not freely and frankly preache the worde, therefore by and 'by they should lay hand on the sword?"—*Sig.* C iv. b.

But we must go on, for there are other witnesses beside Knox and Goodman, of whose testimony we must have specimens. Take the following extract from Bishop Ponet. A few words at the beginning of it have been given already at p. 58, and are here repeated to show the connexion of the passage and render it more intelligible.

"But before the halter stoppe thy winde, Boner, let vs knowe, what thou canst saye for her. Sayest thou, princes be not bounden by theyr othes and promisses? Ynough. What for the rest? let them remembre that not long agoo their neighbour Monsieur Veruin, captain of Boloigne was punished as a traitour, for that by necessitie and extremitie of force he rendred vp Boloigne to king Henry theight and did not die in the defense of it: But thou wilt saie, he did it without commaundement of his maister: and these shall doo it by commaundement of their maistres. But what if the commaundement be not laufull doest thou not saie thy self, it is not to be obeied? Thou saiest to others, that non maie do that is not laufull for any commaundement. But thou wilt saie: it is the Quenes owne, and she maye laufully doo with her owne what she lusteth. What if it be denyed to be her owne? But thou wilt saie: she hathe the crowne by enheritaunce, and maie dispose of the realme, and euery parte of the Realme, as pleaseth her. By I answer: that albeit she haue it bi enheritaunce, yet she hathe it with an othe, lawe and condicion to kepe and mayntene it, not to departe with it or diminishe it. If she haue no more right to the Realme than her father hade, and her father as much as euer ani king of Englande: what neded he to require the consent of the Nobilitie and commons (by parliament) to geue the Crowne to his daughter or any other?

"But thou will saie, it was more than needed: for without consent of the parliament, he might doo with the Realme and euerie parte therof, what it pleased him. Take hede what thou sayest. If that

be true, that king Henry might do with it without consent of the parliament: how is the Ladi mari Quene? why might not king Edwarde his sonne (a prince borne in laufull matrimonie, and right heire to the Crowne) bequeathe the Crowne wher he wolde, and as he did? Take hede what thou doest. If the king and Quene geue thee a thousaunt perdones, yet shalt thou be founde a ranke Traitour to the Realme of Englande. For albeit the king or Quene of a realme haue the Crowne neuer [so] iustly, yet maye they not dispose of the Crowne or realme, as it pleaseth them. They haue the Crowne to minister iustice, but the Realme being a bodi of freemen and not of bondemen, he nor she can not geue or sell them as slaues and bondemen. No, they can not geue or sell awaye the holdes and fortes (as Calese and Barwike, or such like) without the consent of the Commones: for it was purchaced with their blood and moneie. Yea and thine owne popes lawes (wherby thou measurest all thinges to be laufull or not laufull) saie, that if a king or gouernour of any realme goo about to diminishe the regalities and rightes of his crowne, he *ought to be deposed.* Thus did Pope Honorius the thrid commaunde tharchebishop of Collossa and his suffraganes to depriue a king of Vngarie, which went about to waste, sell and geue awaye the Regalities and rightes of his crowne, onles in tyme he ceassed and called backe that he hade done. It is so plaine, thou canst not denie it.

"But I see, Boner, I haue chafed thee to muche: thi chekes blushe and swell for very angre. M. D. Cheadsei, M. D. Pendleton, M. Cosins, or som of you chaplaines, get my lorde a cup of secke, to comfort his spirites. My lorde and I agree almost like belles: we iarre somwhat but not muche, his lordship meaneth that men ought to be alwaies but not at all tymes honest. But I saie, thei must be honest alwaies and at al tymes. His lordeship wolde fayne haue a placarde or prouiso for him and his, that they might somtimes (tha is from the beginning to the ende of the weke) plaie their partes. But I saie, albeit his lordship haue such a priuilege, yet maie no honest man at any tyme doo that is not honest, iuste, and laufull, bi kaisers, kinges, Quenes no, neither his commaundement."—*Ponet*, Sig. E. ij.

The same writer had before laid down this doctrine in a highly characteristic passage;—

"Whan Pharao the tyranne commaunded the mydwyues of the Egipcianes, to kill all the male children that should be borne of the Israelites wyues: thinke ye, he did only commaunde them? No without doubt. Ye maye be sure, he commaunded not only vpon threatned paynes, but also promised them largely: and perchaunce as largely as those doo, that being desirous of children, procure the mydwyues to saye, they be with childe, whan their bely is puffed vp with the dropsie or molle, and hauing bleared the common peoples eies with processioning, Te deum singing, and bonfire banketting, vse all ceremonies and cryeing out, whilest an other birdes egge is layed in the nest. But these good mydwiues fearing God (the high power) who hadde commaunded them, not to kill, wold not obeye this tyranne Pharaoes commaundement, but lefte it vndone.

"Whan the Ioilye quene Iesabel commaunded, that the prophetes of God should be destroyed, that none should be lefte to speake against her idoles, but that all men should folowe her procedinges: did Abdias the chief officer to the king her husbande saye, 'Your grace dothe very well to ridde the worlde of them for those that worship the true liuing God, cannot be but traitours to my souerayne lorde and maistre the king your husbande, and to your grace: and it is these heretikes, that bewitche and coniure you, that your grace cannot be delyuered of your childe, nor slepe quietly in your bedde: let me alone, I will finde the meanes to despeche them all, only haue your grace a good opinion of me, and thinke I am your owne?' No. Abdias (a man fearing God, and knowing this commaundement to be a wicked womans will) did cleane contrary to her commaundement, and hidde and preserued an hundred of the prophetes vnder the earthe in caues. Whan the wicked king Saul commaunded his howne householde wayters and familiar seruauntes to kill the priest Ahimelech and his children for hatred to Dauid: did those his owne nerest wayting seruauntes flattre him forewarde, and saye, 'Your Maiestie shall neuer be in sauetie and quiet so long as this traitour and his prating children (that are alwayes in their sermones and bokes, meddling of the kinges maters) be suffred to lyve? we wil be your true obedient seruauntes, we will beleue as the king beleueth, we will doo as the king biddeth vs, according to our most bounden deutie of allegeaunce, we shall sone ease your highnesse of this grief: other of your graces chaplaynes be more mete for that rowme than this hipocrite traitour?' No. they vsed no suche court crueltie, but considering God to be the supreme power, and seing Ahimelech (by his answeres) and his householde to be giltles of suche mater in forme and intent as (by Doeges accusation) Saul charged him withal, they refused to kill any of them, or ones to laye violent handes vpon them, but playnly and vtterly (being yet the kinges true seruauntes and subiectes) denyed to obeye the kinges vnlaufull commaundement."—*Ponet*, Sig. D. iv.

With regard to Becon, I have not at present access to many of his original editions; and it is not to our purpose to quote those which were afterwards republished with corrections. In his Supplication, however, which I have already mentioned, he is equally plain and express as to the regiment of women. Take the following extract from the long prayer of which his book consists, and forgive me for reprinting matter offensive enough in itself, but rendered tenfold more offensive by the form in which it is presented. But it must be remembered that the author was one of Archbishop Cranmer's Chaplains, and his opinion, especially as he thought fit to give it in so emphatic and solemn a manner, must not be overlooked;—

"But alas for sorow, this most goodly & godly Impe, this moste

Christen kyng, this noble yonge Josias was for oure vnthankefulnes & wicked lyuing taken awaye from vs, before the tyme vnto our great sorow & vnspeakable hartes disease. Whose death was the beginning, and is now still the continuaunce of all our sorowes, griefes & miseries. For in the steade of that verteous prince, thou haste set to rule ouer vs *an woman, whom nature hath formed to be in subiecçion vnto man*, & whom thou by thyne holy Apostle commaundest to kepe silence & not to speake in the congregacion. *Ah Lord, to take away the empire from a man, and to gyue it vnto a woman, seemeth to be an euident token of thyne anger toward vs Englishmen.* For by the Prophete, thou beyng displeased with thy people, threatnest to sette women to rule ouer them, as people vnworthy to haue lauful, natural, and mete gouernors to reign over them. And verely though we fynd, that women sometime bare rule among thy people, yet do we rede, that *suche as ruled & were quenes, were for the moste part wicked, vngodly, superstitious, & geuen to idolatry, & to all filthy abhominacion*, as we may se in the histories of quene Jesabel, quene Athalia, quene Herodias and such like. Ah Lorde God, *we dare not take vpon vs to iudge anye creature*, for vnto the alone are the secretes of all hartes knowne, *but of this are we sure*, that synce she ruled, whyther of her owne disposicion, or of the prouocacion of a certayne wylde bore, successor too Ananias that whyghtie daubed waulle, we know not, thy vineyarde is vtterly rooted vp and layde waste, thy true religion is bannished, and popishe supersticion hath preuayled, yea & that vnder the coloure of the catholicke churche." &c.—*Becon*, Supp., Sig. A. vii.

It is conceivable that Becon might imagine it possible that, in some sort of sense, he, and those whom he expected to use his "Supplication," might be able to say that they dared not "to judge any creature;" and this may perhaps be considered as consistent with his launching such an anathema as the following, provided it is believed that he did not mean it to have reference, or to be applied by his readers, to any particular persons;—

"Those, O Lorde, whiche are thy sworne enemyes and of a sett purpose euen ageynste their owne conscience and contrary to their knowledge persecute the gloryus Gospell of thy derely beloued sonne and the tru fauourers of the same, and wil by no meanes be reconciled, nor leane vnto the truthe, but go forthe dayly more and more to hinder the fre and ioyefull passage of thy holy wored, & to withdrawe so many as they can from beleuyng, receauyng, and embrassyng the same seyng they synne the synne vnto deathe and are not to be conuerted, O Lorde haiste the to root theme vp from the face of the Earthe that they be no more stomblyng blockes to the weake Christians. Destroie thow them O God, let them peryshe thoroughe theyr owne imaginacions. Caste them out in the multitud of their vngodlynes, for they haue rebelled ageynste the. Rayne thowe snares fyre, brimston, storme, and tempeste, vpon them, let this be their porcion to drincke. Let them be confounded and put

to shame, that seke after the lyues of the faithfull. O let them be turned backe and broughte to confusion, that imagine mischefe ageynste them. Let them be as duste befor the wynd, and the Angel of the Lord scattering them. Let their way be dark and slippery, and let thy Angel O Lord persecut them. Yea let soden distruccion com vpon them vnwares, and the netes that they haue layde preuely, cathe [*sic*] themselues, that they maye faull into theyr own mycheff. Let the swerdes that they drawe out go thorowe their owne heartes, and the bowes that they haue bended slea them selues."—*Becon*, Sig. E. ij.

Who were "Those"? Let the question be honestly answered. Was it altogether improbable that such an anathema should be applied in a way not very likely to conciliate the Queen, the Council, and the ecclesiastical rulers? The Queen was supposed to be too much in the hands of the bishops, and the anonymous author of the "Supplicacyon to the Quenes Maiestie" thought fit to caution her on this head in no very equivocal terms;—

"We read also in the 18. chapter off the third booke off the kings, affter that allmighty god at the praier off the prophet Elias, had shut the heauens that it rainid not in thre yeres and six monithes, and king Achab meting with the prophet Elias, he sayd to him: 'thou art he that troblest all Israel' (like as steuen gardener bisshop off winchester and his feloues, saith to the pour preachers and professors of Christes gospell now a days) but Elias words shall answere hym, wherwith he answerid king Achab. It is he and hys complices, that haue forsaken the liuing god, and do go a whoring affter strang gods, as the matter shall plainly appere when god will, like as it did appere by Elias, with the 400. false prophets, which false prophetts had seduced the quene Iesabell, and cawsid her to sley and distroy all gods holy prophetts (like as our false and cruell bisshopps intendith to do) so that the prophet Elias was fain to fly in to the wildernes, to saue his liff, wher god appointid A Rauen to feed hym: but *what was the ende both of the quene and of all those false prophetts?* Read the text, and you shal plainly perceiue that the quene was cast down out of a window wher she brake her necke and was eaten vp of dogs, as the prophet of god had before said, and all here false prophetts and preastes were vtterly distroied.

"Let this greuous example moue your grace do beware the tymes of your false bysshopps and clergye, specyally of steuen gardener bysshop of wynchester."—*Supp. to the Queen*, Sig. A. iv. *b*.

It is hardly necessary to ask the reader to consider what the Queen and the government of England must have thought of those persons abroad who sent over, and those in this country who circulated, such books as I have quoted from, and how they must have felt disposed, not to say com-

pelled, to treat them? The question at present is not how far the matter was right or wrong, or what we may think of it in itself, but what did the Queen and her Council think of it? I do not say what did the King and his Spaniards think of it, for they had enough to think of in other matter more particularly and pointedly addressed to themselves, and of which I hope to give some specimens presently.

ESSAY VIII.

PURITAN POLITICS. No. IV.

THE SPANIARDS.

WYATT — STAFFORD — BRADFORD — BALE — KNOX — PONET — GOODMAN — THE "SUPPLICATION TO THE QUEEN" — THE "TREWE MIRROR."

"I AM come vnto you"—said Queen Mary, to the citizens of London, in the speech which she made to them on occasion of Wyatt's rebellion—"I am come vnto you, in mine own 'person to tel you that which already you see & know, that 'is, how traiterously and rebelleously, a number of Kentish-'men haue assembled themselves against both vs & you. 'Their pretence (as they said at first) was for a mariage 'determined for vs, to the which, and to all the articles 'thereof ye haue bin made priuy. But sithens we have 'caused certaine of our priuy Counsaile to go againe vnto 'them and to demand the cause of this their rebellion, and 'it appeared then vnto our said counsel, that the matter of 'the mariage seemed to bee but as a *Spanish cloak* to couer 'their pretensed purpose against *our religion;* so that they 'arrogantly and traiterously demanded to haue the gouer-'nance of our person, the keeping of the Tower, and the 'placing of our Counsailers."

"Now louing subiects," continued the Queen, "what I 'am ye right wel know. I am your Queen, to whom at my 'coronation, when I was wedded to the Realme and lawes of 'the same (the spousall ring whereof I haue on my finger,

'which neuer hitherto was, nor hereafter shall be, left off) 'you promised your allegiance and obedience vnto me.'

After an appeal to their sense of duty as subjects, her Majesty proceeded to say: "As concerning the mariage, ye 'shal vnderstande that I enterprised not the doing thereof 'without aduice, and that by the aduice of *al our priuy* '*council*, who so considered and wayed the great com- 'modities that might insue thereof that they not only 'thought it very honorable, but also expedient, both for the 'welth of the realme, and also of you subiectes."

And after further declaring that in this matter she was not following her own self-will, she added: "Certainly, if I 'either did thinke or know that this mariage were to the 'hurt of any of you my commons, or to the impeachment of 'any part or parcel of the roial state of this realme of Eng- 'land I woulde neuer consent thereunto, neither woulde I euer 'mary while I liued. And in the worde of a Queene I pro- 'mise you that if it shal not probably appear to al the nobility 'and commons in the high court of parliament, that this 'mariage shal be for the high benefit and commodity of al the 'whole realm, then I will abstaine from mariage while I liue."[1]

This view of the "Spanish cloak" concealing other views and purposes is taken by the principal historian of Wyatt's rebellion[2], who tells us:—

---

[1] Fox, vol. ii. p. 1289. Ed. 1596.

[2] The full title of the work from which I extract is, "The historie of 'Wyates rebellion, with the order and maner of resisting the same, 'wherunto in the ende is added an earnest conference with the degenerate 'and sedicious rebelles for the serche of the cause of their daily dis- 'order. Made and compyled by John Proctor. Mense Ianuarii, Anno '1555." It was "Imprynted at London by Robert Caly within the precincte of the late dissolued house of the graye Freers, now conuerted to an Hospitall, called Christes Hospitall: The x. day of January 1555." Small 8vo, b. l., containing N, the two last leaves blank. There is some account of the book in Brydge's Censura Literaria, (Vol. IV. p. 389,) where it is said, "Proctor was schoolmaster of the free school at Tunbridge, and from his vicinity to the scene of action must have had greater opportunity of knowing the particulars of the rebellion than many others." This is I suppose grounded on Anthony à Wood's account, *Athenæ*, Vol. I. p. 235. Lowndes, after mentioning several copies which have been sold (from the imperfect Roxburghe for 2*l.* 16*s.* to Mr. Bindley's at 9*l.*,) says, "According to Hearne, 'This rare book was much made use of by Ralph Holinshed in his Chronicle. It was always reckoned a book of great authority by such as are impartial and are well versed in English history."—*Bibliogr. Man.* in v. *Proctor.*

"Consideringe with hymselfe, that to make the pretence of his rebellion to bee the restoring or continuaunce of the new and newelye forged religion was nether agreable to the nature of heresie (whiche alwaye defendeth it selfe by the name and countenaunce of other matter moore plausible) neyther so apte to further hys wycked purpose, being not a case so general to allure al sortes to take part with him: he determined to speake no worde of religion, but to make the colour of hys commotion, only to withstande straungers, and to aduaunce libertie. For as he made hys full reckninge that suche as accorded with hym in religion, wold wholly ioyne with hym in that rebellion.[3] So he trusted that the Catholikes for the moste parte, woulde gladlye imbrace that quarel agaynst the straungers, whose name he toke to become odible to all sortes, by the sedicious and malicious report, which he and hys hadde maliciously imagined and blowen abrode agaynst that nation, as a preparatiue to their abominable treason. Hys Proclamation therefore published at Maydstone, and so in other places, persuaded that quarell to be taken in hande only in the defense of the realme from ouerrunnynge by Straungers, and for thaduauncement of libertie. Where in verye dede, hys onely and very matter was the continuaunce of heresye, as by hys owne wordes at sundrie times shal hereafter appeare.

"And to the ende the people should not thinke that he alone with a fewe other meane gentlemen, had taken that traiterous enterprise in hand without comfort and ayde of higher powers, he vntruely and maliciously added further to his proclamation, by persuasion to the people, that all the nobilitie of the realme, and the whole counsell (one or two onelye except) were agreable to his pretensed treason, and would with all their power and strength further the same, which he found most vntrue to his subuersion. And that the lord Aburgauenye, the lorde Warden, Syr Robert Southwell, high shyreffe with all other gentlemen wold ioyne with him in this enterprise, and set theyr fote by his to repel the straungers.

"This proclamation, and such annexed persuasions made at Maydstone on the market day, and in other partes of the shire, had so wrought in the heartes of the people, that diuers which before hated him, and he them, were nowe as it seemed upon this occasion mutuallye reconciled, and sayde vnto him. 'Syr, is your quarell onelye to defend vs ouerrunning by straungers, and to aduance libertie, and not agaynst the Queene?' 'No,' quod Wyat, 'we mynde nothinge lesse, then anye wyse to touche her grace: but to serue her, and honour her accordyng to our dueties.' 'Wel,' quod they, 'geue vs then youre hande, we wyll stycke to you to deathe in this quarell.' That done, there came to hym one other of good wealthe, saiyng: 'Syr,' quod he, 'they saye I loue potage well, I wyll sell all my spones, and al the p'ate in my house, rather than your purpose shall quayle, and suppe my potage with my mouthe. I truste,' quod he, 'you wyll restore the ryght religion agayne.'

[3] That he was not mistaken in his calculations on this point may be seen by evidence which has been already adduced in these papers; as well as by the way in which he and his rebellion are spoken of by the leading men of the puritan party.

'Whiste' quod Wyat, 'you maye not so much as name religion, for that wil withdraw from vs the heartes of manye: you must only make your quarel for ouerrunninge by straungers. And yet to thee be it sayd in counsell, as vnto my frende, we minde onely the restitution of God's word."—*Fol.* 3. *b.*

That the good commons of England might at any time be worked upon by representations that they were being sold as slaves into the hands of strangers and foreigners, is very conceivable: but that the match between the Queen and Philip of Spain was really disliked by the people in general, or considered by them as a national grievance, may very well be questioned. At the same time, we must not be surprised, that the matter has been represented in that light by modern historians, who have too generally and too implicitly followed the statements of the most violent agitators of the period, who had, as Mr. Proctor observes, "maliciously imagined and blowen abrode" a "seditious and malacious report" calculated to render the very name of the Spaniards "odible to all sortes." Thus Bishop Burnet tell us:

"It was now apparent, the queen was to marry the prince of Spain; which gave an *universal discontent* to the whole nation. All that loved the Reformation saw, that not only their religion would be changed, but a Spanish government and inquisition would be set up in its stead. Those who considered the civil liberties of the kingdom, without great regard to religion, concluded that England would become a province to Spain, and they saw how they governed the Netherlands," &c.—*Hist. of Ref.* Vol. ii. p. 249.

And again—

"But *great discontents* did now appear *everywhere*. The severe executions after the last rising, the marriage with Spain, and the overturning of religion concurred to alienate the nation from the government."—Ibid. 268.

Of course it is very easy to talk of "universal discontent" and "the whole nation," and to tell us that "discontents" appeared "everywhere;" but perhaps it would not be easy to justify the use of such language by particular details. Certainly there were some discontents, and some attempts to create more. For instance, Stafford's rebellion, which it may be worth while to refer to more particularly, because it not only illustrates our present subject, but is a good specimen of the manner in which history is too often made. Strype gives us (from that

curious miscellany the "Foxii MSS.") the proclamation which this rebel issued, and which begins thus:

"To all and every singular person and persons, of what estate or degree soever they be, that love the common wealthe, honoure, and libertie of this ower native countrye, and moste for the realme of England, the Lorde Thomas Stafforde, son to the Lorde Henry, rightfull Duke of Bockingham, sendythe greetinge. Knowe ye, most dearlye belovyd contrymen, that we travellinge in strange realmes, and forren nations, have perfectly proved owt manye detestable treasons, which Spanyardes shamfullye and wrongfullye have pretended, and at this present have indevered themselves to worke against ower noble realme of Englande; we therfore more tenderlye favouringe, as all trewe Englishmen owghte to do, the common commodity and weal publycke of this ower natyve contrye, than ower welthe, treasure, safegarde, health, or pleasure, have with all possible spede arived here in the castell of Scarborowe, levyng owr band, wherwith we thoughte to have proved in other affayers, comyng after us, bycause we had perfect knowledge by certaine letters taken with Spanyardes at Depe, that this same castell of Scarborow, with xij other of the moste chefest and principall howldes in the realme, shalbe delyvered to xij thousand Spanyardes, before the Kinges coronation: for the Spanyardes saye, it were but vaine for the Kinge to be crowned, onlesse he maye have certaine of our strongest castelles and holdes, to resorte to at all tymes, till he maye be able to bringe in a greate armye to withstonde his enemyes, that is, to overrun and destroye the wholle realme: for, so long as Englyshemen have anye power, we truste they will never submitte themselfes to vile Spanyardes. Which treason we have disappointed; trustinge, and firmelye belevinge, by the mighte of the omnipotente, everlastinge God, with the ayde and helpe of all trewe Englyshmen, to deliver owr country from all presente peril, daunger, and bondage, wherunto it is like to be broughte, by the moste develyshe devize of Mary, unrightful and unworthye Quene of England, who, both by the will of hir father, Kinge Henrye the viijth, and by the lawes of this noble realme of England, hathe forfette the crowne, for marriage with a straunger. And also hathe moste justlye deserved to be deprived from the crowne, because she being naturallye borne haulfe Spanyshe and haulfe Englyshe, bearythe not herselfe indifferentlye towardes bothe nations, but showinge herselfe a whole Spanyarde, and no Englyshe woman, in lovinge Spanyardes, and hatinge Inglyshemen, inrichinge Spanyardes and robbinge Inglyshemen; sending over to Spanyardes continuallye the treasure, gowlde, and silver of our realme, to maintaine them for owr destruction; sufferinge poore people of England to lyve in all carefull miserye, manye of them dyinge for verye hunger: and not contented with all thes myschyfes, she sekynge earnestlye by all possyble meanes to place Spanyardes in our castelles and howldes, contrarye to all statutes, customes, and ordinaunces within this realme, that they maye burne and destroye the countrye iij or iiij tymes yerelye, till Englyshemen can be contented to obeye all their vyle costomes, and moste detestable doinges, wherby the

whole commonaltie of Inglande shalbe broughte to perpetual captivitie, bondage, and moste servyle slaverye, as evidently shalbe proved before all men, at our fyrste assemble."—*Mem.* Vol. III. P. ii. p. 515.

This rebellious proclamation is given by Strype, in what he calls the "Catalogue" of documents, annexed to the Memorials; and, notwithstanding something almost tautologous, the passage of his history which refers to the matter, may amuse the reader as a specimen of the unsuspecting simplicity with which Strype received and adopted every statement proceeding from what he considered the right side. If it were not so mischievous, it would be merely ludicrous to see how the rhodomontade of this rebel proclamation is transmuted into mere matter-of-fact history.

"The Government by this time became very uneasy, not only in respect of the bloodshed for religion, and the rigorous inquisitions made every where, but for the domineering of the Spaniards, which was intolerable. The English were very much disregarded, and the Spaniards ruled all; the queen, half Spanish by birth, and still more so by marriage, shewing them all favour; hating the English, and enriching the Spaniard, and sending over her treasures to Spaniards. King Philip also had required twelve of the strongest castles here in England; which were to be put into the hands of twelve thousand of the Spanish soldiers, to be sent over against the time of his coronation, as was found by certain letters taken with Spaniards at Diep. This raised a great apprehension in the nation, that he intended to get this realm to himself by a conquest, and to reduce it under a tyranny. That nation also had carried themselves here very disobligingly to the English, and would say, that they would rather dwell among Moors and Turks, than with Englishmen; who sometimes would not bear their insolencies and oppressions without resistance.

"This, together with a hope of restoring himself to the dukedom of Buckingham, made Thomas Stafford, of that blood, in April arrive in England out of France with forces, and possess himself of Scarborough castle; giving out himself to be governor and protector of the realms; intending to depose Queen Mary, whom he called, the unrightful and unworthy Queen of England, as forfeiting her crown by marriage with a stranger, and for favouring and maintaining Spaniards, and putting castles into their hands, to the destruction of the English nation. Stafford, with his party, (who were the remainders of those who made the insurrection the last year) put forth his proclamation. But the King and Queen, being greatly surprised herewith, April 30, sent out a proclamation against him and the other traitors with him; and they were soon quelled by the Earl of Westmorland and others in those parts. Stafford and four more were taken in Scarborough castle, April 28, and brought up to the Tower: and twenty-seven more, that assisted in that exploit, were prisoners in York. May 28, Stafford was beheaded on Tower-

hill; and the next day three of the accomplices were executed at Tyburn, viz. Stretchley, alias Strelly, alias Stowel, Proctor, and Bradford; that Bradford, I suppose, who wrote a large and notable letter, mentioned before, against the Spaniards."—*Mem.* III. ii. 66.

It does not seem to have occurred to Strype that the fact of these rebels meeting with no encouragement—their being, as he says, "soon quelled by the Earl of Westmoreland and others in those parts"—that is, by the English, who were intrusted with such a business, while "very much disregarded, and the Spaniards ruled all"—that the traitors were quietly hanged at Tyburn instead of being cut into mince-meat by the king and his twelve thousand domineering Spaniards[4]—it does not, I say, seem to have occurred to him, that these circumstances might justly excite some suspicion as to the perfect accuracy of some statements in the rebel proclamation, and his own view of the state of things in the country generally.

Whether Strype is right in supposing the John Bradford who suffered for the part which he took in this rebellion, to be the author of the work of which I have already spoken at p. 85, I do not pretend to decide; but his mentioning him will very naturally introduce some extracts from his work. First, however, let us have the copy of verses which are appended to it, and which, as I have already stated, do not appear quite in accordance with his vehement profession of fidelity to the old religion.

"¶ *A tragicall blast of the Papisticall trompette for maintenaunce of the Popes kingdome in Englande.*

" Now fil the cup & make good chere,
This golden chaines must needs obei:
England is ours both farre & nere,
No king shall reigne if we say nay.

[4] It is of great importance to observe how the rhodomontades of history are softened down. Strype says, "twelve thousand of the Spanish soldiers *to be sent over* against the time of his coronation." The copy of the rebel proclamation, which he gives from the Fox MSS. leaves the matter open. But the royal proclamation against the rebels (which Strype also gives) distinctly charges the Rebel with "having dishonestly stated in his "shamefull proclamation" that "the Kings Majestie, our sayde soverayne Lord *hath* induced and brought into this realm the number of twelve thousande straungers and Spaniardes." Which of these statements is correct I do not pretend to decide, but of course it was much more to the purpose to tell the Englishmen that the Spaniards were actually in the country, than only that they might be expected.

Now all shauen crownes to the standerd,
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Spare nother man, woman or childe,
Hange and hed them, burne them with fier:
What if Christ wer both meke & mild
Satan our lord wil geue vs hier.
Now al shauen crounes to the standerd
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Pope innocent our father old
When Peters keis cold doe no good:
He cursed them a thousande folde,
And drowned them in Tibers floud.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" He said we must pauls swerde now take,
Splay the banner, strike vp the droome,
Fall to aray, pike and halfe hake,
Play now the men, the time is come.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd,
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Our golden hatte we muste defende,
Though Christ say nay, we wil it haue,
And it maintaine vnto the ende,
Al kinges to vs be bonde and slaue.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" The Pope our father hathe al rule,
The deuil to him wil neuer say nay,
But maketh him richly to ride on mule.
In worldly pompe, which may not decai.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd,
Make rome pul down for the Spaniard.

" The Spaniards hath sworn vs to defend,
So that we betraye Englande to them:
Make hauock now the people to spend,
As Herode did once in Bethleem.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Doe you not see this Englishe in feare:
Their hart is driuen into their hose.
xiii we burned of late together:
Thei durst not snuffe once with their nose
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd,
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Hey courage, courage, my felowes al,
The getting ship must bere a proud saile,
If we draw backe our kingdom wil fal,
If we be stoute nothing shal vs faile

Now al shauen crownes to the standard,
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Lay shame aside, let honesty go,
Beare out al matters be they vntrew :
Say trew men be traitors & fathe Qu. foe,
Banish al truethe and falshode renew.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd,
Make rome, pul down for the Spaniard.

" Our iust must we haue, who can sai nay,
This god once said to our father Caine,
The world is our reigne and worldlie staie,
We shal not decaye but alwais remaine.
Now al shauen crownes to the standerd
Make rome, pul downe for the Spaniard.

" The author to Englande his naturall countreye.

" England repent whiles thou hast space,
If thou couldest repent as Niniuie did,
Then sholdest thou be sure of gods grace
And so might thy enemies quite be rid.
But if thou be blinde, and will not see,
Then hasteth destruction for to destroi the."

But to come to Bradford's own part of the work. He dedicates it thus,

" To the right honorable lords &c. the erles of Arun-dell, Darby, Shreusebury & Pembrok, their true and faythfull seruaunt wisheth, as to al other of our nobilitie increase of grace in gods fauour, wyth perfect honor, and the preseruacyon of their most honorable estates and country. Thoughe ye reioyce not in readyng my foolyshe reasons, yet geue God thankes, that I haue discouered suche detestable treasons."

And then, after a passage which has been already partly quoted, he says ;—

" I wil write nothing to disturbe the trew and most godly state of oure religion, whiche the Quenes maiestie moste graciouslye setteth out at thys present, and wherein god hath preserued me: nor yet, to disturbe the quiete estate of the commonwealth : But in shewing what is pretended to the contrarye, declare vnto you the way, if it please you to folowe my counsell, how to preserue youre lordeshipes, and the whole realme, from most miserable bondage

and captiuite. I purpose to declare a part of the naturall disposicion of Spaniardes: certayne of their premeditate mischeues, and pretensed treasons, not onely agaynst your most honorable persons, but also agaynst the whole realme: so farre, as I haue heard, seene and proued, for the space of two or .iii yeres in their companye. My frendes putte me to learne their language and compelled me to liue amongest them, because I myghte knowe perfectlye, whether their nature were so vyle, as men reported, or not. And I assure your lordshipes, and all my frendes, that the vileste reporte, that euer I heard Englishmen speake, by the worste of all Spaniardes, is nothinge to the vilenes which remaineth amongest the best of that nacion, except the kings maiestie. Ye wil say the noble men be very ciuill persons. In very dede I haue not seen so muche vertue in all the reste, as in that most noble Prince the duke of Medenazelye. A Prince, vndoubtedly, endewed with perfect humilitie, trueth, loue, charite and all other prince like vertues."—*Sig.* A. viii.

It will be observed that Bradford writes as if he were under a suspicion that his reader's opinion of the character and proceedings of the Spaniards, formed on actual observation, might be somewhat different from what he wished to inculcate,—"ye wil say the noble men be very ciuill persons." Indeed, the reader cannot fail to observe in subsequent extracts, that the evils and abominations of the Spanish alliance were matters of prediction rather than of fact.

"But wherfore should I spend my time, in showing so mani of their vile condicions, as I knowe moste perfectly. For me thinke I heare some noble man starte at these fewe principall pointes saying: 'What a vyle knaue is this, that raileth so muche against the Quenes frendes.' Would to god that wer trewe: we know moste perfectly, they loue her treasure faithfully, and her crowne hartely. But if her grace worke prudently, she shall perceiue spedely, they loue her person fainedly. I haue not spoken the worst nor the most, lyke a rayler, but showed a small nomber of rype rotes, from the which spring a thousand moe mischeffes, for out of eueri rote spring .vii. braunches, and out of euery braunche doe spring .vii. worse wormes or stinkinge serpentes of more mortall poison, then either the rotes or spitful braunches. As for example, take their pompynge pryde, and ye shall proue *their purpose once obteined*, thei wil treade your heads in the dust, and compel you to liue at home porely, without bearing rule in the commen wealth. Thinke you, to liue at home in your country: no they knowe perfectly you woulde then haue all people vpon your part and make insurrections, to driue them out of the lande: they wil prouide for this matter, and put you to death louingly, before you make such controuersye, that they may gather vp againe *their great giftes*, vpon youre treasures, and maintaine their gorgious garmentes, with their *false brybrie:* their fine Spanishe brauerye with oppression of the pore people, and bye their lustye liueries with exceading great excises. There be many other

braunches, but I shewe these for a brefe example, that ye may by your wisedomes picke out the rest. And yet if ye pull of euery braunch vii. serpentes, ye shal finde a deuelish companie.

"As for example. *When ye bee* trodden vnder foote, marke my woordes well, euery skurueie knaue shal come to your house and take the best part, leauing you the worste. Ye must obeie him like a Senioure, ye must geue them the best beddes, and take the worste pacientlie for youre selfes: for you haue lord Dannes come againe of them, and thei shall putte you in rememberaunce of the miseres that your parentes suffered vnder them, whiche ye haue forgot, thei are so long past.

"The worste of them *shall bee* better estemed, with the kinge and his counsel, than the best of your realme, ye must be gladd to geue them place not of curtesie, but of perforce: they must be set in the higheste place, and you in the loweste. If one of them be appointed in your house, by the kinge or his counsel, or els receyued for his moneie, the house must be his and not yours.

"And yet will he departe without taking leaue or paying for lodeging.

"Some man will sai, that it is not true: for they haue paide euerie man iustly the vttermost pennie. *I speake not of that, whiche thei haue done in Englande*, but of that which the most parte of them dooe in these countries, and thei *wil dooe*, when they maie beare rule, euen amongest you in Englande.

"And yet, I thinke, there be some, that paid not verie iustlie for al things when thei were amongest you laste. For I myselfe knowe manye worshippeful menne, which, if thei durst, woulde take their othe, and seke for recompence, that lodged, ye that lodged Spaniardes, in their house a yeare and more, and lette them haue halfe a dossen beddes and chaumbers with all thinges perteininge to them, a greate parte of their fyre wood, and such other stuffe for buttery and chereles kitchen, &c. And yet the Spaniardes at their departing would nother paye for many thinges that were stollen, nor for many things that were lost, as thei said, nor for many thinges that were broken and rente, nor to speak plainly, for many thinges which were so" [instead of a few words omitted, *read* filthy from their diseased state], "that no man could lye in them afterwardes. I know diuerse of them, that paide their accoumptes so iustlye, & toke their leave so honestly: that their hostes knew not of their departing, but left the bakers, bruers, bouchers, woodmongers and coliers, one of them to paie anothers skore. Yf thei departed stoutly in these dayes, when *they dissembled al goodnes, when thei trusted to winne the gouernaunce of the realme and the crowne with gentlenes and good condicions:* what wyll thei doe, I praye you, when they haue the crowne indede? But to returne ye muste geue them leaue to speake when you must holde your peace, ye must cap to them in all places where ye see them, although it be not your custome, or rather thers indede yet he is a very rusticall beast, that doeth it not to them: for ye know, the worste of them is a Senior: ye must preferre them in all thinges, and geue all the names of honor, excepte maiestie, to the vilest slaue amongest them."—*Sig.* B. ii. *b.*

"Some of their false flattering fauorers will saie, that all men maie perceiue perfectly, that I slaunder Spaniardes wrongefullye: for *they haue holpen many synce their comming into England.* But remember I tolde you they counterfeited condicions, because they mighte seme like vnto vs, and the more easely disceaue vs.

"For *that whiche thei haue done in Englande*, was no part of their nature, but the greatest part of dissimulation, and a plane *preparacion* to disceaue our nobilite. For wherefore should thei seke to maintaine our nobilite, and the honor of the realm in his own estate: doe ye thinke, if thei obtaine the crown, they will mainteine the nobilite and the realme vpon their own charges: were it not better for them to destroie the nobilite and bring the kingdome, which thei loue so well, to their own commodities?"—*Sig.* B. v. *b.*

The following prediction of what the English court was to become when the Spaniards had quite got their own way, is too graphic and too much to our purpose, to be omitted.

"Ye haue heard many euils, but god is witnes I cannot for shame write or declare the vile, shamefull, detestable, and moste abominable reportes, whiche they haue spoken by the Quens maiestie: and yet her grace thinketh them to be her very frendes: but this one trueth I will shew couertlie, and wrappe it in as cleane cloutes as I can, desiring all men and the Quenes highnes herself most humblye, to take it after their words. The Spaniards say, if they obtaine not the crown, thei may curse the time that euer their kinge was bounde in mariage to a wife, so vnmete for his maiestie by natural curse of yeres, but yet if the thing maye be brought to passe, which was ment, in the mariage in a king, thei shal kepe old riche robes, for high festifal daies. If there be any man that doth not vnderstande this saying of Spaniardes, let the Quenes highnes, so long as her grace wil haue any fauourable frendship of the kinges maieste, kepe her selfe as heigh in auctorite & as rich, as she is at this present, or els her grace shall perceiue perfectly, as she maye partly at this present, that Spaniards naturally loue fresh wares, yong deintie dishes, and chaunge of new things.

"I thinke the Quene will blame me, for showing this one trueth, but by that time her grace shall be glad, to tie horsses vnderneth her chamber windowe, to suffer vile stinking donghils at her priuie chamber staires, to see her garde chamber garnished about with plaine wals, finely furnyshed with riche pallets, of strong corse canuas, wel stuffed with strawe, the wals most comly colored with coles, to see sitting among her graces yemen, curriers, carmen, and cobblers, woodemonges, vintners, and waggeners, pointers, pinners, and pedlers, showemakers, surgeaunts, and sadlers, bokebinders, bakers, brewers, with al kinde of lowsie loiterers, and euery one a bagge, a budget, or a bottell hanged open beefore him, tyed vnder hys arme, or behinde vpon his backe, more like a moste misordered hospitall then a kynges garde chamber, that nother her highnes, nor any of her nobilitie, can passe that way. For indede the garde in the kinges courte be suche bawdye, burly beastes, that they

neuer come in the kinges chappell, excepte for necessitie when straungers come to the courte and abyde the smell of suche a stinkinge stue.

"Her grace will say I speake not all. When her pallice gates shal stand open, without porters, that not only beggers, slaues, and all kinde of wretches, but also oxen, kine, hoggishe olde swinne, shepe and lambs, goats, kiddes, and rammes, cattes, dogges, geese, ducks, cockes, and hennes, with all other suche good houshold stuffe, may enter into her courte, and standing, rubbing, rowteing, diggeng, deluing, and donging, before her chamber windowe, like a good fermers house in the countrey, when her highnes hall shall be one daye hanged with riche arreisse, and halfe a year after, ether shut, and locked vp, or els furnished finely with spinners, silke-twiners, weuers of laces, ropmakers, coblars, and bochers of olde hosen, moste shamefullie without all order, and be glad to kepe within her most princelike palice a vile stinking baudy tauerne, that euerye one of these fore saied craftesmen, and all other baudes, beggers, slaues, and vile dronken wretches, maye bie within her courte breade, beare, nuttes, apples, and chese, and fetche wine and water out of the kinges courte, by iiii. penny pintes, and that with the dearest, accordinge to the olde, auncyente, and moste honorable customes of the Emperours maiesties courte, and the kinges maiesties palaies here in flaunders, her maiestie shal wel perceiue, that I kepe many thinges secret whiche I am ashamed to declare.

"Ye will thinke I speake the worste, but when the Quenes grace shalbe glad to fetche her wine out of the tauern by eight pense, and a halfe peny the quarte: as the king and bothe the Quenes doe here in this courte, her highnes shall well know, that I cold show much worse orders, and manye thinges more vile, more shamefull, and more dishonorable than these, and by that time all these thinges be wrought ordinarely, in the court of Englande, ye shall smell them more vnsauerly. Al men that be here continuallye, doe see muche more and many worse thinges, then I write.

"But if these things wil not make your lordships worke wiseli and be circumspect in deliuering the crowne, looke further vpon youre proceadinges, and when your lordships shal be glad, if ye might escape so well, to be at the Spanishe counsels commaundement, and wander with Spaniardes from one countrey to another, and where ye liue at this present with all plentiful prouision in your own houses, be compelled to lie in good tiplinge houses, & rost halfe a capone to your supper and kepe the rest for your dinner, with a pinte of white wine and water, a pigges petitooes, a younge shepe trotters, halfe a loine of leane mutton and iiii. or. v grene sallettes, as the best of the kings counsell do liue daily, ye wil say, woulde to god we had kept the crown in our owne handes, for the right and lawful heires of the realme to whom it belongeth by iust and lawfull discent, and bene trewe to our countrye, so that we might have reigned still and lyved more honorable in reste, wealth, and quietnes, then any nacion in the world."—*Sig.* E. iv. *b.*

One might, indeed, transcibe the whole book; but I will at present give only one more extract from it. I have

passed over passages in which Bradford tells the nobility that their destruction was decided on, and explains how it was to be effected; and in the following passage he comes home to the business and bosoms of the commonalty. The reader may have perceived his propensity to run into rhyme; of which this extract is no bad specimen;—

"Ye will say the Spaniards kepe their olde rentaking: how can that be, when euery poore man must pay yerely for euery chimney in his house, and euery other place that is to make fire in, as ouen, fornes, and smithes forge, a frenche crowne: wil englishmen, or can thei, suffer to be poled and pilled moste miserably, in payeng continually suche polingpence, and intollerable tollages for all maner graine and breade, befe, beare, and mutton, goose, pigge and capone, henne, mallard and chicken, milk, butter and chese, egges, apples and peares, wine white and reade, with all other wines beside, salt white and graye, al thinges must pay, small nuttes, and wall nuttes, cheries, and chest nuttes, plumbes, damassens, philbeardes and al both great & smal whatsoeuer thei maye se to fede the pore commenalte. Salmon, and hearing, this is a shamefull thing, tench, ele or conger, this shall kepe vs vnder, and make vs die for hunger, flounders, floucke, plaice or carpe, here is a miserable warke, that Englande must abide to maintaine Spanishe pride: ye paye youre tenthes for all these things, but I speake not of churche rentes, nor balifes fees, for that is but the tenthe part, but this shall greue your harte, to pay the thirde part more, that burthen waieth sorer than fines or rents, tak hede therfore. Ye wil think their commens be not so oppreſt: there is not a yeman, farmer nor husbande man in these partes, that dare eate a capone in his own house if his frende come to viset him, but the capone must cost him a noble, if it wer worth xx. pence and euen so of hennes, pigges, geese, chickins, and all other thyngs. Dooe ye thinke to make prouises for all these mischefes, which I haue rehearsed: the best prouiso ye can deuise to make is, that for the auoiding of all these and innumerable moe mischefs ye kepe the crowne in your own handes, and geve it to no forreyne prince."—*Sig.* F. ii.

Whether our author is the person who was hanged is of little consequence in our inquiry. I have expressed a doubt, the grounds of which it is not worth while to discuss, whether he was a real person, and at all events I do no quote him as an authority, but only to show what sort of writing was then in circulation, for the purpose of rendering the King and his countrymen hateful to the people. But I do not mean to rest the case on such evidence. Let us see what "ministers of good estimation" said about the Spaniards, and how far those who were taking the lead in the religious movement of the time were likely to conciliate the popish "straungers" towards the protestant faith and

its professors. This will be shown by a few brief extracts from the works already quoted of Bale, Knox, Ponet, and Goodman.

"Will. Kethe," as Strype says, "a Scot, and exile at Geneva, endued with a vein of poetry, showed his good will to the Spaniard" in some stanzas. These have been already given, at p. 89, *verse* 12, &c.

As to Bale, too, I have already given one extract from his Declaration of Bishop Bonner's Articles, in which he speaks of "Jack Spaniard," whom he describes as "being as good a Christian as is eyther Turke, Jewe, or pagane" (p. 57); and the following may be added without looking further than that peculiar work;—

"O rare Confession, the Popes fishyng net, the discouerer of princes hartes, and betraier of christen kinges and their kingdomes, thou hast sence thy fyrst beginning wrought wonders. England be ware in time, for thyne owne Judases are about to betray the to double straungers, to cruell Spaniardes for filthy lucres sake, and to the deuils of hel by their daily Idolatries."—*Sig.* C. i. *b.*

"Moreover (saith Bonner) they must rebuke all sedicion and tumulte, wyth all vnlawfull assemblyes. A good pretence, I promise you. As thoughe that shouen and disguised nation, had never bene the begynners of sedicyon, the sowers of tumulte, and prouiders of leude assemblies. . . . . But I pray ye, lette me axe you this one question by the waye. Is it or no, any hygh waye to sedicyon, or meane to sorowfull tumulte, to suffer so manye newe straungers to enter into the land? Yea so filthy, so wicked, and so cruel as the Spaniardes are knowne to be? If ye canne not assoyle me thys question now, I doubte not but ye shal wel do it within a few yeares with dolors & sorowes inexplycable, whan their vnlawful assmblyes shal be such, as England felt neuer the lyke. At that day shal ye cal to remembraunce this saiyng of Jeremies lamentacions wyth great heauinesse of harte. 'See O Lord what we haue sufferred, and consider our confusion. Our inheritaunce is tourned to the straungers, and oure houses to the aleauntes.'"—fo. 54, *b.*

Bonner having spoken of "the Kinge and Quenes maiestie," in his xix Article, Bale tells him that "England had no such king in the moneth of September when these articles were put fourth," and he afterwards says—

"'Here hath Bonner by his absolute power, geuen England an vncrowned King out of a straunge lande. And agayne he hathe vnauthoryshed his owne naturall king Edwarde the syxte notynge hym an vsurper, a scismatike, and a slanderous heretick, as foloweth in the xxxvi Article concerning the laity and in other besydes. So

vnnatural a bastard is this beastly bite shepe to hys most naturall country of Englande.'"—fo. 68, *b*.

Knox's view of the matter may be judged of by the following extract from his "Blast":—

"If yet, I say, God wold not suffer that the commoditie and vsuall frute, which might be gathered of the portion of grounde limited and assigned to one tribe shulde passe on to another: Will he suffer that the liberties, lawes, commodities and frutes of hole realmes and nations, be geuen into the power and distribution of others, by the reason of mariage, and in the powers of suche, as besides, that they be of a strange tonge, of a strange maners and lawes, they are also ignorant of God, ennemies to his truth, deniers of Christ Jesus, persecutors of his true membres, and haters of all vertue? As the odious nation of spaniardes doth manifestlie declare: who for very despit, which they do beare against Christe Jesus, whome their forefathers did crucifie (for Jewes they are, as histories do witnesse, and they themselues confesse) do this daye make plaine warre against all true professors of his holie gospell. And howe blindlie and outragiouslie the frenche king, and his pestilent prelates do fight against the veritie of God, the flaming fiers, which lick vp the innocent blood of Christes membres, do witnesse, and by his cruel edictes is notified and proclaimed. And yet to these two cruell tyrannes (to France and Spaine I meane) is the right and possession of England and Scotland apointed. But iust or laufull shall that possession neuer be, till God do chaunge the statute of his former lawe: whiche he will not do for the pleasure of man. For he hath not created the earth to satisfie the ambition of two or three tyrannes, but for the vniuersal seed of Adam: and hath apointed and defined the boundes of their habitation to diuerse nations, assigning diuerse countries as he him selfe confesseth."—p. 48, *b*.

Ponet writes in complete harmony with John Bradford. The reader will observe the very same strain of concession and prediction;—

"But ye will saye, ye haue no warres with any forain prince. It is true: but shall ye haue none? yes, yes: the tyme is not yet come, all is not hatched that is vnder the henne. Your winges must be dubbed, your fethers must be pulled, your combes must be cut, you must be cleane piked, your substaunce shalbe gotten by littel and littell out of your handes, by taxes and subsidies, by beneuolences and loanes, and so from a litell to more, and from more to more: and at leyngth all the marchauntes goodes to be confiscate in Flaunders by an inquisition, and others in England by an open excommunication. And whan ye be ones cleane stripped of your stoare, and thus weakened out of courage, and your harte in your hose, as they saie: than shall your king returne to his welbeloued wife, England, with great pompe and power, and shall compell you (in despite of your hartes) to rendre and deliuer her holly into his handes. Than shall the easterlinges (vpon hope to recouer their

olde and greater priuileges) aide him with men money and shippes: as allready they haue offred and promised, as diuerse credible lettres haue declared. Than shall they inuade Englande, and shalbe by shiploades (if no worse happen vnto you) carried into newe Spaine, and ther not lyue at libertie but bicause ye are a stubburne and vnfaithfull generacion, ye shalbe tyed in chaynes, forced to rowe in the galie, to digge in the mynes and to pike vp the golde in the hotte sande. And so with sorowe to your soppes, your three mannes songs shall be, Alas, and weale awaye. Than shall ye knowe the pride and lordelynesse of the Spanyardes, *though for a while til they maie get the ouer hande, they crepe and crouche, fede men with swete wordes* (Baso las manos) *and women with confettes, swete wynes, pleasaunt perfumes, gaye apparail, and suche like vayne toyes:* but whan they be ones alofte, ther is no nacion vnder the cope of Christ, like them in pride, crueltie, vnmercifulnesse, nor so farre from all humanitie as the Spanyardes be: which thing the realme of Naples, the Dukedome of Milane, the citie of Siena, many partes of Duchelande, and the lande of Iulike Cleuelande and Geldre lande can to theyr coste right well testifie."—*Pol. Pow.*, *Sig.* L. iij. *b.*

Goodman, speaking with reference to judgments which he had just denounced, says,

"And iustly maye the Lorde to all this do you, seinge he gaue you not this dignitie, makinge you Counsellers, Noble men, Rulers, Justices, Mayers, Shireffs, Bayliffs, Counstables, or Gaylers to exalt your selues agaynst his Maiestie, and to fight agaynst Christe and his members: but to humble your selues in his presence, to promote his glorie, and to defende all those whom he committed to your charge. How commeth it then to passe, that ye haue thus betrayde him and his people, in banishinge his truthe to receaue falsehod, and haue changed Religion in to superstition, true honoringe of God, in to blasphemous idolatrie, and now (to finishe your procedinges) are readye to sell your subiects for slaues to the prowde Spaniards, a people with out God."—p. 95.

And a few pages farther on he breaks out;—

"Gods worde she abhorreth, Antichriste hathe she restored, her fathers Lawes contemned, her promesse broken, and her brother Godly kinge Edwarde as an heretique condemned, not thinkinge it ynoughe to expresse her tyranny vpon them that liued, except she shewed crueltie, or rather a raging madnesse on the bodies of Gods seruants longe before buried, drawing them forth of their graues to burne them as heretikes. And in fine vtterly abhorring the Englishe nation, hath ioyned her self to adulterous Philip, the Spanishe kinge: to whome she hathe, and dothe continually labor to betray the whole kingdome. And yet ye cannot, or will not see it, nether yet for all this be stirred vp to bridell her affections, and withstand her vngodly doinges, to promote the glorie of God, and to preserue your brethren, and your selues: but thinking to reteyne your promotions by flattery, do hastelie drawe Gods vengeance vpon your selues and others.

"For do you thinke that Philip will be crowned kinge of Englande, and reteyne in honor Englishe counsellers? Will he credite them withe the gouernment of his estate, who haue betrayed their owne? Shall his nobilitie be Spaniardes, with out your landes and possessions? And shall they possesse your promotions and lyuinges, and your heads vpon your shulders? Come they to make a spoyle of the whole Realme, and leaue you and yours vntouched? Where is your great wisdome become? Your subtile counsels and policies, where of your bragge so muche, to whome these thinges be hid, that euerie childe espieth?"—p. 99.

The "Supplicacyon to the Quenes Maiestie," which has been already mentioned (p. 85), begins thus;—

"A supplicacyon to the quenes Maiestie.

"In moste humble wise Complaynyth vnto your highnes, that wher as this noble realm off England, hath of long tyme out of mynd bene the most fre contre in all Christendome, Now is lyke to be brought in to bondag and slauery of such a nacyon as all the world both hatyth ann abhoryth. The only occasion ther off is our vnthankfulnes, as our preachers and true prophetes declarid vnto vs in the tyme off your brother, that most vertues prynce king Edwardthe vj. That yff we wold not be thankful for that great benyfyte off godes holy worde, then truly preachyd among vs. God wold take away our sayd vertues king, and set vp a strang king raygne ouer vs, for our vnrepentant hartes, who shuld bring in agayn, popery, ydolatry, and all abhomynacyons, as it is com to passe this day."

Much more to the same effect might be quoted from this work, especially from the "Exortacyon to the lords and comons of the Parliament house" which it contains; but I will at present give only two short extracts;—

"I cannot hold from you my natiue contremen what I haue herde in other contres, with what policys and feches, the bisshopps and clergie of this realm, vse for the stablishment of ther kingdom which yf it come to passe wylbe the vtter decaie, subuercion, and distruction, of this noble Realme of England. They intend by one crafte or other, that the prince of Spaine shalbe crownid King of England, as is aforesaid, and to haue this noble realme of England to hym and to hys heires, and so contrary to the statutis made in the other perlyaments, dysinheryte all the reightfull heyres of the Realme. And after he hath gotten that quyetlye, then they will not leaue to prycke hym forward, and to cawse this noble Realm of England, to be brought into bondage and slauerye, lyke as the emperoure hath done Naples, Myland, and hys nether contres of Flanders, Holland, Seland, Brabant, Fryseland and Lytzelburg, &c." —*Sig.* C. iv. *b.*

"A lamentable case, that neuer a noble man in England wold serue for the quenes Maiestie, but that England must be fayne to bestowe all ther treasure and ryches, to bring in a stranger to raine

ouer them, who with the bisshoppes aduise and helpe will bring this noble realme in to beggery and vyle slauerie: And yet for all this, when he hath goten that he hath sought (that is) the realme into hys hands, then it will appere, that he will sett asmich by here, as men sett by ther old showes: Is not the quene and all Englishmen bound to curse such a wickid gardener, for bringing in to this realm, such weeds, as will not only ouer grow, and distroye, the noble and good corne, of this noble realme, but weede out the welth, ye vtterly rote out the hole state theroff in euery degree. This is a plage aboue all plages, which is com vpon vs, for our vnthankfullnes, acording as our trwe prophets and preachers, declarid to vs. Yf we wold not amend our lyues, and knowledge the tyme of our visitacion."—*Sig.* C. vi. *b.*

There is another book of the year 1556, entitled "A 'trewe Mirrour or Glase wherin we may beholde the wofull 'state of thys our Realme of Englande. Set forthe in a 'Dialogue or communicacion betweene Eusebius and Theo-'philus," from which, though it is anonymous, and I do not find any account of it except a mere transcript of the title in Herbert's Ames,[5] I am tempted to add one or two extracts, because it is written with more moderation than most of the works which I have quoted, and I think that the reader will find in the passages laid before him, some things strongly confirmatory of the opinions which I have expressed.

"*Eusebius.* But yet (ye shal not be offended with me for that I wil say) there were of your sort, which are called the newe learnynge many euil men.

"*Theophilus.* It was most trew brother Eusebius and cannot be denyed. For there were in hel no veryer deuils then many of them were that professed the gospel, for otherwyse there could haue ben no couler of these lyes and slaunders that are now spred, as is said before. For it was Iudas that bare the pouche, and it was Iudas that betraied hys master: and many Iudasses in England vnder the pretence of religion robbed both kynge and realme these iudasses filled their own pouches, and made themselues rich, and noble, and they care not who rule so long as they may geat and enioye their possessions.

"*Eusebius.* Well brother Theophilus here are no more but you and I, and I dare be bolde herein to tel you my mind. For I know you vnderstand in it as muche as I, and more to, and I dare say you do with a great a gref behold it and sorow it as any English heart wil doe. I heare say the king of Spayne shal at last be crouned kyng of England, what say you to that:

"*Theophilus.* Alas brother Eusebius what should I say to it: If

[5] Vol. III. p. 1595.

god haue determyned, who maye wythstande: we muste commyt it to his good pleasure and wyll.

"*Eusebius.* But do you not thynke it a plage:

"*Theophilus.* Yes verely and an vtter desolacion of Englishe bloud."—*Sig.* A. viii.

"*Theophilus.* When kyng Henry was deade, kyng Edwarde hys sonne by the meanes of hys vncle then Lorde protectour subuerted al the Popes religion, put down masse and altogether, wherewithall they were well contented, and set forewarde the matter withoute any scruple of conscyence, I warrante you. And many goodly lawes they lette make, as wel for the mayntenaunce of that religion, as also for the preseruacion of a commen wealth, and before kyng Edwarde was fullye dead, they had concluded also with the Duke of Northumberlande, vnder pretence of the stablishing of that religion, and other goodly consideracions as it were to make hym kyng, contrary to al right, and contrary to all the statutes of parlemente and so woulde haue disheryted the Quene that nowe is, agaynste her fathers wil, agaynst theyr own lawes, agaynst al their othes and promise, and without any iust cause, at that time. And all this notwithstanding, when they sawe how the game would goe: they were contented to serue the Quenes wyll, and nowe haue they sworne backe agayne to the holy father I heare say: now agayne wheras the Quene goeth about not onely to breake her fathers wil and al such lawes and statutes as were made for the preseruacion and safegarde of thys realme, but is also determined of a selfe wyll to brynge England into the subieccion of a foren Prynce, they haue not onely consented and agreed, but are also chefe doers and procurers thereof, for god hath blynded theyr eyes, and theyr vnderstanding, so that they cannot see mor perceaue, their own destruccion, and yet euery child seeth and euery good heart mourneth at it full heuely.

"*Eusebius.* Now surely Theophilus you haue spoken as trewe as the gospell, for if he be once stablished king, he may without contradiccion furnishe al the fortes in Englande with his owne men, for I would not thinke him wise to trust straungers so muche as his own countre men: when he hath therefore brought that to passe he may at all times bring an army either out of flaunders or spain, the shyppes being also at hys commaundement and thorow Englande may he goe at hys wyll and pleasure, who wil saye hym naye: Alas miserable case.

"*Theophilus.* Nay nay Eusebius he shal nede none army to bryng this matter to passe, for if the Quene liue seuen yeres to an ende, he wyll so vse the matter that Englande shalbe easy inough to rule, for marke ye now how fast the gentle men go to the tower, yea and some to hanging also. And ye see the gentlemen for the most part be of this newe learnyng, and therfore ye know vnder pretence of religion there wilbe matters inough to ridde the most part of the nobilitie of Englande, and all thys shal we be made to doe within ourselues, we shalbe inueigled thus to doe one agaynst another by traynes and baites to seake one anothers destruccion, whereunto many are very prest, and al to do the Quene a pleasure. Marke how

thys geare commeth to passe, for the Spaniard hath nothing to doe in al this (as we suppose) but rather getteth pardons, and showeth great fauour to Englyshe men, but ye may be sure they haue debated thys matter in theyr heades, and in all this they make the Quene serue their turne, and her own fancy also."—*Sig.* B. i. *b.*

Let me, without at present burthening him with any other remarks on these extracts, remind the reader, that our inquiry is, how far the measures of the English government were influenced by the writings of the puritans. Had the king and his countrymen influence, or had they not? did they know of these writings, or did they not? if they did, were they conciliated by them towards the party from which they emanated?

ESSAY IX.

PURITAN POLITICS. No. V.

THE CHANGE OF RELIGION.

GOODMAN—PONET—TRAHERON—THE "SUPPLICATION"—BECON.

IN one of the preceding essays[1] I stated that those passages which it would be necessary to quote, in order to give an idea of the effect which the writings of the Puritans, and especially the Exiles, were likely to have on the government in England, might be conveniently distributed into four classes.

First, such as had, generally speaking, a revolutionary tendency, and were calculated to teach the lawfulness of insurrection and rebellion of subjects against their rulers.

Secondly, those which were particularly directed against Queen Mary, on the ground of her sex, her birth, or her personal character.

Thirdly, those which were intended to render odious the Spaniards, and the Spanish match. And—

Fourthly, those relating to the change in religion, repre-

[1] See before, p. 87.

senting it as a judgment in itself, and as a sin which would bring down other judgments.

As to the first three heads, I have spoken pretty fully, and in so doing it has been impossible to avoid very direct and frequent reference to the fourth. Indeed, the subjects are so naturally, and even necessarily, blended by the writers of that school and period, that one seldom finds one of these points discussed by itself; and sometimes all are inseparably united. As an instance of this, take the following extracts from Goodman's treatise, "How superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects":—

'Wel, the day of the Lorde will come, when you shal fele what it is to fight for your Masse, and to betraye the Gospell, to rise and rebell agaynste your lawfull Prince, and to obeye and defende a bastarde, and open enimie to God, an vtter destruction of the whole realme: to murther and banishe your naturall countriemen and louing brethern, to honor and receaue strangers Gods expresse aduersaries: a cruell people, a prowde nation: a people of a farre and of a strange langage, whose tongue ye shall not vnderstande, an impudent nation, and hard harted people, without all pitie and mercie, which netherwill be moued with the lamentable voyce of the mothers, nor shewe anie compassion for the pittifull crye of their sucklinges and infantes. And whi? because ye haue chosen to obeye vile man, yea a raginge and madd woman, rather than the almightie and mercifull God. Repent, repent, ô ye people of England, for your destruction is at hande. Forsake with spede the vnlawfull obedience of fleshe and bloude, and learne to geue honor in tyme to the liuing Lorde, that he maye staye his hande, and drawe to him agayne his stretched out arme, that you may fynde mercie, and that the bothom of your cupp be not turned vpwards.

"Alas saye you, what is this we heare? Be not the people, of themselues, as sheepe without a pastor? If the Magistrates and other officiers contemne their duetie in defending Gods glorie and the Lawes committed to their charge, lieth it in our power to remedie it? Shall we that are subiectes take the sworde in our handes? It is indede as you saye, a great discouraging to the people when they are not stirred vp to godlynesse by the good example of all sortes of Superiors, Magistrates and officers in the faithefull executing of their office: and so muche more when they are not defended by them in their right and title, as wel concerning religion, as the freedome of their naturall countrie: but moste of all when they, which shuld be their guydes and Capitayns, are become instrumentes to inforce them to wicked impietie. Neuertheles, all this can be no excuse for you, seing, that euil doinges of others, whether they be Lordes, Dukes, Barons, knights or any inferior officers, may not excuse you in euil. And thoghe you had no man of power vpon your parte: yet it is a sufficient assurance for you, to haue the warrant of Godds worde vpon your side, and God him self to be your Capitayne who willeth not onely the Magistrates

and officers to roote out euil from amongest them, be it idolatrie, blasphemie, or open iniurie, but the whole multitude are therwith charged also, to whom a portion of the sworde of iustice is committed, to execute the iudgementes which the Magistrates lawfully commande. And therefore if the Magistrates would whollye despice and betraye the iustice and Lawes of God, you which are subiectes with them shall be condemned except you mayntayne and defend the same Lawes agaynst them, and all others to the vttermoste of your powers, that is, with all your strength, with all your harte and with all your soule, for this hath God required of you, and this haue you promised vnto him not vnder condition (if the Rulers will) but without all exceptions to do what so euer your Lorde and God shall commande you."—p. 178.

Here the reader will find all the points, briefly indeed, but rather forcibly touched on. At the same time this point—the change of religion—was one so obvious, so important, and so avowedly that which gave weight and interest to all the rest, that we may reasonably expect to find it treated of in particular. So it was in more ways than one, though to one only I must confine myself on the present occasion, because the evidence, which appears to me to be extremely interesting, and (though I pretend to no discovery) too little known and regarded, would exceed the limits of a single essay. I, therefore, at this time, content myself with putting together some extracts, which will show the reader how the question was treated, if not without some passion, yet with political gravity, and a show of argument by the puritan divines. Take the following specimens from the work of Goodman, already mentioned;—

"Art thou then, being a subiecte commaunded to worshipp stockes and stones which this day to our shame are erected agayne in Englande? Beholde thou hast Gods commandement for thy defence: Thou shalt commit no idolatrie, nor make to thy self any grauen image, &c.

"Art thou charged to be at the idolatrous Masse, wherin Christe thy Lorde is blasphemed? Beholde he hath geuen thee an other charge: that is, to celebrate his Supper, according as he left in example, saying: Do you this, that is, which ye se me do, and not which the powers of the worlde, or the pestilent papistes commande. Also do it (saith Christe) in rememorance of me, and not of your frindes alyue or departed, as teache the Papistes. For none of them died for you. Moreouer do it to shewe forth the deathe of Christe, til his coming, as witnesseth the Apostle: and not to make a new sacrifice for synne, as the Papists blasphemously both teache and preache.

"Art thou commanded by men to dishonour the Sabbathe day in worshipping of Sainctes and abstayning vpon their dayes and euens

from thy lawfull busines? Beholde, God thy Lorde chargeth thee no further then onely with his daye of reste, saying: See thou keepe holie the Sabbath of the Lorde thy God: and not of Peter, Paule, Marie, James or John.

"Art thou commanded to sweare in the name of Marie and all the Saincts in heauen? (which is the papistical othe) Beholde, the Lord saithe, Thow shalt onely sweare in the Name of thy Lorde and God.

"Art thou commanded not onely to take the Name of the Lorde in vayne, but also to forswere thy selfe moste shamefully agaynst Gods glorious Maiestie, and the honour of our Sauiour Christe? (as all they haue done which lately haue sworne to acknowledge Antichriste the bloudy butcher of Rome to be their head and gouernour) Beholde, The Lorde will not suffer his house vnpunished that taketh his Name in vayne: muche lesse such periured and forsworen wretches.

"Art thou commanded to persecute thy parentes and frendes, charged not to succour them in their necessitie, because they professe the doctrine of saluation?

"Art thow forbidden lawfull mariage, because thou art a minister of Gods worde, and permitted to lyve in all kind of filthie vnclennesse, as do the Sodomiticall Priestes, Monkes, Freers, Nonnes, Cardinales, Deanes, Archdeacons, and all other orders of Satan: beholde such dothe the Lorde God as most abominable of all other, commande *to be put to death.*

"To be shorte, when they contrarie to their othe and profession, commande thee to receue Antichriste, the beastlie Bishoppe of Rome, with all his filthie dregges of damnation: to burne the worde of God and the faithful interpreters and professors of the same: to forgo the comfortable preaching of the Gospel, and reading of the Scriptures: to persecute Christe in his members: to ayde the enimies with thy goods and bodie agaynst the deare children of God: to fight in other countries without any iuste cause or occasion, and to suffer thy wiffe, children, kinsfolkes and countryemen to be moste cruelly spoyled, oppressed and murthered for want of thy defence at home as they most shamfully haue done of late, which at the commandement of that cruel tyrant, prepared them selues to fight agaynst the Frenche kinge, and their owne brethern the Skottes, whiles the Spaniards put them selues in a redinesse to entre the Realme and make a generall spoyle and pray of all.

"These thinges and many such like are playnly forbidden you by the manifest worde of God: and therfore to do them for feare or pleasure of anie Prince or power, is playne disobedience and rebellion agaynst the Almightie. And contrarie wise, to answere in this case, and to do as the Apostles haue taught, that is, to obeye God rather then man, is the onely waye to discharge your consciences, to do your dueties, and to please God: no more to be made by ignorance the instrumentes of his sworen enimies (what title so euer they beare) to subuerte Gods glorie, oppresse your brethern, and distroye your countrie: but repenting your former ignorance and impietie, *to be made instrumentes of the contrarie to the vttermost of your power*, least you be taken in your synne, and preuented with

the bitter cup of Gods indignation, alreadie prepared for the workers of iniquitie, and all such, as are ayeders, and partakers with them, when nether power can defend the superiors, nor their commandmentes excuse the subiectes."—p. 170.

"Matathias that worthie Captayne of the Jewes, as it is wryten in the firste boke of the Machabees, coulde not so lightly excuse him self when he was commanded by the cruel officiers of wicked Antiochus (which had spoyled their Tempel, rased their waules, murthered their brethern, and set vp idolatrie, in so muche as all for the moste parte, applied them selues to their wicked parsuations) that he, with the residue shulde forsake the Lawes and sacrifices of their God, to worshipp strange Goddes: he made answere, to the officer of Antiochus the kinge (which would to God our Noble men had perfetly learned): That thoghe all Nations apparteyning to kinge Antiochus shulde obeye him, so that euery man would declyne from the Lawes of his countrie: yet I, (saieth he) my children, and brethern, wil stand in the conuenant of our fathers &c. Which thing he performed in dede to the glorie of God, to his owne saluation, and comforte of his brethern and countrie for euer.

"And euen at the self same tyme he slewe, not onely a Jewe, one of his owne brethern, which came to sacrifice in his presence at the alter Modim, according to the prescript of Antiochus: but killed also the kinges officer, that compelled him therto, and afterwarde distroyed the altar, and folowed the Lawe of God with a zeale, as did Phinees. Matathias had then a little power amongest his brethern, but nothing to defende himself agaynst the kinge, and also being charged with children and kinsfolk (which semed to be all his power) woulde nether pollute him self, nor suffer them to be polluted with wicked idolatrie, nor causeles, to be oppressed with tyrannie. And yet we reade of no auctoritie or office he had to excuse him by: but onelie this one thing which was comon to all other of his nation, the Lawes of their countrie, and couenant of their fathers. Which cause he thoght sufficient to discharge his conscience before God, and to approue his doings. For as muche as God had commanded him not onely to denie to do the commandement of the cruell tyrant Antiochus (vnder whom all Jerusalem then was by conqueste) but *manfully to professe him and his, as open aduersaries to his Lawes and to resiste idolatrie by force, in killing the idolatrer and the kinges seruant (by whom he was compelled) and in subuerting the altar, where vpon the idolatrous sacrifice shuld haue bene done.* Which was, as you see, manifeste resisting of the superior power, being but man, to the intent he might shewe true obedience to his Lorde and God, in defending and maynteyning his Lawes (which he calleth the couenant of their fathers) yea and with the temporal sworde to the vttermost of his power. Then if Matathias herein did discharge his conscience before God and man, in resisting by temporal power the kinge, his commandements and officiers: it is not onely the office of Apostles and preachers, to resist, but the dewtie likewise, of all others according to their estate and vocation."—p. 75.

"Repent, repent you miserable men: for your synnes be at the highest, your cupp of iniquitie is full, and the houre of your heuy visitation is come: when it will be too late for you to flee from the great wrath of Gods indignation, whiche shortlye is like to be powred vpon you. Then shall you well perceaue that there is no saluation but vnder Gods protection, no comforte with out Christ, no obedience agaynst God, no power that can dispence with the charge of the Almightie and his commandements: especiallie when all your counsels agaynst him and his poore seruants shall fall vpon your owne heades: your wisedome turned to follie, your noblenesse to vilenesse, your rule and dominion taken from you, and you made slaues to others: your fayre howses and gorgeous buildinges destroyed, your great possessions geuen to your enimies, your wiues to be ravished, your mayds deflowred, and children murthered with out mercy, your pride and hie lokes abated, your welthe turned to miserie, your delicate faare and costlie aparell to extreame hunger and beggerye, your ioye and pastance to weepinge and continuall sorrowe, and in the end shamefull deathe as you haue deserued. And why? Bycause you haue chosen to obeye man rather then God, and sought rather to mayntayne your owne pride and dignitie, then his honor and glory.

"And therefore beholde ô prowde man, I am come to thee (Jere. 50) saithe the Lorde of hostes because thy daye is come, and the tyme when i will visite thee. For the prowde shall fall and be distroyed, and there shall be no man to lift him vp. I will kindle a fire in his cities, that shall consume all thinges about them," &c.—p. 93.

To "obeye man rather than God," was (in the language of these writers) simply to permit the Queen to reign instead of rebelling and dethroning her; and while Goodman thus expostulated with the council and magistrates, Ponet, in his book on "Politike Power," appealed to the most vulnerable parts in the great body of the commons—their fears and their stomachs.

"The Preachers and ministers of Goddes worde, in the tyme of the godly Iosias King Edwarde the Sixthe, preached and prophecied vnto you what miseries and plages should certaynly come to you: the foode of Goddes word to be cleane taken away from you, famyn of the body, pestilence, warres, and losse of your goodes, the deflouring and rauishing of your wyues and daughters before your eies, the captiuitie of your bodies, wyues and children: the subuersion of the policie and state of the Realme: that a straunge King and straunge people (not only in countrey, but also in condiciones and maners in respecte of your owne) shoulde reigne and rule by force ouer you, if ye in tyme repented you not of your wickednesse, amended your lyues, and called to God for mercy.

"But than ye passed nothing on it, but as the Jewes being downed in sinne, mocked, scorned and murthered the prophetes of God which long before prophecied vnto them their captiuities and vtter destruc-

tion: so ye laughed and iested at your preachers wordes, nothing regarding the threattes of God, but contemnyng them, yea increaceing in your wickednesse, and now at lenght murthering most cruelly the ministers of God.

"And seeing wordes of warnyng toke no place with you, God for his louing mercie hathe warned you by monstrous marualies on the earthe, and horrible wonders in thelement, to put you beside all maner of excuses. What wonderful monstres haue ther now lately ben borne in Englande? What celestial signes most horrible? A childe borne besides Oxforde in the yeare, M.D.LII. with two heades and two partes of two euil shaped bodyes ioyned in one. A childe borne at Couentree, in the yeare M.D.LV. without armes or legges. A childe borne at Fulham by London euen now this yeare, with a great head, euil shaped, the armes with bagges hanging out at the elbowes and heles, and fete lame. A childe newe, borne at London furthewithe speaking as a prophet and messager of God. An horrible comete this year, besides diuerse eclipses, which folowe. But what were these? only bare signes? No certaynly, they doo and must signifie the great wrathe and indignacion of God."—*Sig.* K. iij. *b.*

"The childe of Oxforde what did it betoken, but that our one swete head, King Edwarde should be taken awaye (as he was in dede) and that ther should be in his place two headdes, diuerse gouernours, and a towarde diuision of the people, but not all together: which so manyfestly followed that no man can denye it: or two people should be knytte together, but not in god [*sic*] proporcion nor agrement.

"The child of Couentrie without the principal membres to helpe and defende the bodye, must nedes signifie, that the natural body, that is, the people of Englande shalbe helples, ready to be troden vnder the fote of euery creature, and non to releue or succour it.

"The childe of Fulham, what can it signifie, but that the natural body of England shalbe weake, the chief membres (tharmes and legges) which is the nobilitie, so clogged with chaynes of golde, and bagges of money, that the hande shall not be hable to drawe out the sweorde, nor the heles to spurre the horse, to helpe and defende the body, that is the commons. And as the head of it is the greatest part, and greater than it ought to be, with to muche superfluitie of that it should not haue, wherfore it must pull from the other membres to confort it, and lacke of that good proporcion it ought to haue: so shall the gouvernours and headdes of Englande sucke out the wealth and substaunce of the people (the politike body) and kepe it bare, so that it shall not be hable to helpe itself, yet shall the head neuer comè to that nature requireth.

"What is to be gathered of the yong child, I doo not saie it is true, bicause the father was forced (onles he wold haue lost his life) to recant it: but might it not be true? Is ther not as muche to be saied for it, as for the popes transubstanciacion?"—*Sig.* K. iv. *b.*

And how could even those who were unmoved by these statements resist the appeal by which the writer followed it

up, and which showed the practical effects of idolatry and the mass in a way which might touch the feelings of those who had never heard of the "euil shaped" child at Fulham, or any other of the "monstrous maruailes" on which he grounded his argument for discontent and rebellion?

"Whan were euer thinges so deare in Englande, as in this time of the popish masse and other Idolatrie restored? Who euer hearde or redde before, that a pounde of beefe was at iiij.d. A shepe xx.s. A pounde of Candelles at iiij.d. A pounde of Buttur at iiij.d. ob. A pounde of Chese at iiij.d. two egges a penie, a quatre of wheat lxiiij.s. A quatre of malt at i.s. or aboue: the people driuen of hongre to grinde accornes for bread meale, and to drinke water in stede of ale?"—*Sig.* K. viii.

Some cautious persons might have thought this line rather dangerous while the suppression of the monasteries was still recent; but Ponet was a bold writer; he was quite awake to this, but he had his answer ready, and even those who may not think it quite satisfactory, will allow that it was highly characteristic;—

"But me thinkes I heare your papistes bishoppes, priestes, friers, and suche like Antichristian monstres saie, that these plages which haue fallen and shal come to England (for they knowe, they cannot be a voided, no they are occasioned and holpen forewarde by them) haue growne for thinges done in king Henry and king Edwardes time, for that their abominacion was disclosed, their buries and dennes digged vp, their monasteries throwen downe, and the landes diuided and solde to the laitie. Ah hipocrites, Ah subtil wolues, ah viperous generacion, Whan the foxe preacheth, beware your geese. Wher in scriptur do they finde that any suche bely Goddes as they are should be maintened? No, scripture wold haue such marchauntes whipped out of the churche, such buiers and sellers of mens soules, wo be vnto you hipocrites (saieth Christ) for ye swalowe vp the houses of the poore and miserable, that is, that which should be converted to the relief of the poore and nedy: and that vnder pretense of long praiers. Wo be vnto you (ye masking Mahoundes) which goo from place to place, by sea and by lande, to make a nouice of your owne ordre, and whan ye haue him, ye make him the childe of hel fire two folde more than your selfe. I knowe you no t(saieth Christ) awaie from me, ye workers of iniquitie. It is only their God the bely, that they seke to serue, they nother passe on the God in heauen, nor the deuil in hell, so they maie haue wherwith to maintene themselues on earthe, in their hooredome," &c.—*Sig.* L. v. *b.*

I do not know that a better place can be found for the remainder of a passage from Bartholomew Traheron, "Warning to England," the former part of which has been already given in the fourth of these essays[2].

[2] See before, p. 65.

"But I wil leaue that botomeles sea, of most filthie stincking vices & passe farther. The commons of Calece consisted partely of papistes, and partely of men reformed in religion. The papistes were there, as they be euerie where, murmurers against god, gredie scrapers, enuious, lecherous, ful of secrete vices, but they were few in nombre, and lesse besprincled with innocent blood. The Christianes were weaklinges, dissemblers, quenepleasers, worldlinges, riotous, wanton & giuen to al fleshlie lustes for the most parte. I comme now to thy commons England, of which some be gentlemen, & those either papistes, or protestantes. The papistical gentlemen ar slaues to poleshorne priestes, to exequute their boucherie, folowing therein parte of thy nobilitee, in bloodie crueltie worse than Shythians, in oppressing the poore Neroes hellish offspringe, in greedie conuetousnes verie Harpyes, in malice, and enuie yonge diuels, traitors to their countree, open deceauers, vile flatterers, filthie lechers, herteles cowardes, shameles braggers, godles Epicures. The gentle men protestantes for the most parte differ from thother in knowledge only, and not in life, in wordes, and not in worckes. The like conuetousnes, the like malice, and enuie, the like craftines, the like cowardise, and vnfaithfulnes in defending their countree, the like flatterie, the like lecherie, the [3] in fleshlie pleasures, the like liynge is found in both sortes. And the commune people to be shorte so countrefait the beastlie, and abominable maners of theyr superiors, that they maie be compted their awne children, their awne brode aswel as their countremen. I speake of the great multitude. For I know that in euerie sorte, and condition of men, there be some that truly feare god. But in the order of thy nobilitee al the godlie maie be grauen in one ringe. Amonge thy prelates, and priestes I know not one, and yet I exclude not al of that most filthie swinestie."

Clearly, however, as this belongs to our subject, we may perhaps be keeping more closely to that part which is more immediately before us, by reflecting on one or two specimens of the denunciations of John Knox. In his "Godly Letter sent too to the fayethfull in London," &c., he says:—

"Playne it is, that the soule hath neither lyfe nor comfort, but by God alone, with whome Idolatours, hath no other participation then hath the deuils, and albiet that abominable Idolatours, for a moment tryumphe yet approcheth the houre when Gods vengeaunce shall stryke, not onely their soules, but evin their vile carcasies shalbe plagued, as God before hath threatned. Their cyties shalbe burned, their lande shalbe layd wast their enemies shall dwell in their stronge holdes, their wyues and doughters shalbe defyled their chyldren shall fall in the edge of the swerd, mercy shall they fynde none, because they haue refused the God of all mercye, when louingly and longe he called vpon them. You would know the time & what certitude I have here off. To God wil I appoint no tyme, but that these and mo plagues shall fall vpon England, and that ere it be

[3] A word or two cut off in the binding.

long, I am so sure, as that I am that my God lyueth. This my affirmacion shall displease many, and shall content few, God knowith the secretes of all hartes, knoweth that also, it displeaseth myselfe, and yet, lyke as before I haue been compeled to speake in your presens (& in presens of others) suche thinges, as were not pleasable to the eares of men, whereof (alas) a great part this daye are come to passe, so I am compelled now to wryte with the tears of my eyes, I know to your displeasur. But deare brethren, be subiect vnto God and geue place vnto his wrath, that ye may escape his euerlastinge uengeaunce."—*Sig.* A. iii.

Again, in his "Confession":—

"Beholde our trobles and apparant destruction, and staye the sworde of thy vengeaunce before it deuowre vs. Place aboue vs o Lorde for thy great mercies sake, such a head with suche rulers and maiestrates as feareth thy name, and willeth the glory of Christ Jesus to spred. Take not from vs the light of thy Euangely, and suffer thou no papistrie to preuaile in this realme."—*Sig.* F. ij.

"O Englande, let thy intestiue battelles and domesticall murther, prouoke the to purety of lyfe, according to the worde, whiche openly hath bene proclaymed in the, other wise the cuppe of the Lordes wrathe, thou shalt shortly drynke of. The multitude shall not escape, but shall drynke the dregges, and haue the cuppe broken vpon their heades, for iudgement beginninge in the house of Lorde, commonly the least offendor is fyrst punished, to prouoke the more weked too repentaunce. But O Lorde, infinite mercye, yf thou shalt punishe, make not consumacion, but cut awaye the proude and luxuriant braunches, which beare no fruyte, and preserue the common wealths of suche as geue succour and herber, to thy contempned messengers, which longe haue suffred exile in deserte, so be it."—p. 17.

The same strain is pursued in the "Supplicacyon to the Quenes Maiestie," which has been already quoted:—

"But they wold not obey goddes holy prophetes but murtheryd them as playnly apperyth (lyke as our bysshopes will murther gods true preachers and prophets now adays which haue preachid the lyke message of god) but what folowid for ther vnthankfulnes, dyd not god plage them by sending strangers among them whych destroyed many hundryd thousands in ther former tymes off ther captyuytes and changes off ther comon weale, and at the last vtter dyssolucyon: namely, at the destruccyon off Jerusalem, by Titus and Vespacianus the emperours, and also dystroyed ther goodly cytes, caryed them out off ther own contres, wher they be now scateryd abrode, made slaues, dyspysyd off all nacyons as it is manifest and playne at this day. This is a goodly example for your grace and for all chysten prynces to marke and to haue all wayse before your eyes, least ye and they be found vnthankful."—*Sig.* A. ii. *b.*

The reader will not fail to observe the significant and pregnant hint with which this extract concludes. The

simple fact was, that the intent of that publication was to represent the queen as a mere tool in the hands of the clergy, and in particular, of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. A little further on it cautions her majesty:—

"for gods sake beware of hym betimes, least ye be partaker of hys wikidnes, and so both you and the whole Realme repent it, and com to vtter distruction. for hys doings declare that he is at a point with hymselff and hath made conuenannte with death and hell, Esa. 28. and beleuith that ther is no resurrection of the flesche nor liff after this: and therfore what carith he yf he help to bring this noble realm into bondage and slauery, seing he thinkith ther is no nother waye, to maintein hys pomp, pride, and vain glory with all, And therfore the greater shalbe hys dampnacion, besids gods great plages which shall come vpon hym sodenlie, when he thinkith all is well, and in quiet, them shall sodenly com his confucion and vtter distruction, becawse all his doings be so directly against god, and all right, as his own consciens knowith the same, to his dampnacion, yf he haue any conscience or feling of god, and therfore beware that ye be not partaker with him."—*Sig.* A. vi. *b.*

Again,—

"Euen so I think that your grace doth this ygnorantlie, that ye haue done, and being thereto perswadid by your false dissembling bisshopes and clergie: Whom now that your grace hath warning, what they are: beware from henceforth that ye folowe ther counsel no more in persecuting Christes poure membres, which haue bene the trewe prechers of his holy and blessid worde, but do ye as S. Paul dyd when he was callid, And submitt your selff, vnder the mighty hand of god, and turne to the lord our god who is able and wyll receyue you to grace and mercye as he dyd S. Paul, of ye repent and do as he dyd, wherby you shall saue your selff and the whole Ralme from Ruyne and vtter distruccion. But yf you wyll not submitt your selff vnder the mighty hand of god, and turn to the lord our god vnfainidlie, and folowe no more, the wyckid counsell of your bloudy bisshoppes and clergie, in persecuting Christes pour members, and wyll not receyue and knowledge the time of your visytacion. Then be ye assuryd, that lyke as it happenyd to the Jewes for persecuting Christe and hys pour members, so shall it happen to you and to the whole Realme, as in the beginnyng of this supplicacion is declaryd at large."—*Sig.* B. viii. *b.*

The same line is taken, both as it regards the clergy generally, and Bishop Gardiner in particular, by Becon in his Supplication, and when we consider all the circumstances of the case—that is, those of the writer, as well as those of the persons of whom he wrote—it seems quite necessary to give some specimens. I do it indeed with some hesitation, because to my own feelings the passages are very disgusting, from the form into which the doctrine

is thrown. The idea of thus making up prayers, and professedly addressing such matter to the Almighty, appears to me in the highest degree revolting. But the simple fact is, that this is what was then written and circulated by a man of station and influence in the party—what then found readers,—what is even now not so universally disliked but that it has admirers, and has been recently reprinted as matter worthy of preservation, not merely in an historical and antiquarian point of view. We may, therefore, safely assume that it was not without readers, admirers, and influence when it was written. Our business, however, is to inquire whether, supposing all contained in these extracts to be quite true and good,—supposing that the Queen and her Council and Bishop Gardiner were, in themselves, and in all their circumstances, just what Becon supposes and describes—whether this mode of writing about them was likely to have any effect on their feelings and course of action? was there any good in writing thus? Was it really a holy and Christian love of the truth which led men who had been happy enough to escape into quiet resting places, to send over such missiles as could only aggravate the fierceness of persecution on the one hand, and the wildness of fanaticism and the wilfulness of rebellion on the other?

"But now the shepehardes, yea, rather the wolfes, which are braste into thy shepefolde, and with violence haue vniustly thrust out the faythfull and fatherly pastores out of their cures, are lordely, cruel, bloud-thyrstye, maliciovs and spyteful agaynste thy shepe.

"They are such wolfs as spare not the flocke but scatter and destroye the flocke.

"They are theues, robbers, murtheras & soule slears. thei fede them selues with the fattest & clothe them selues wythe the fyneste wolle, but thy flocke thy noryshe not, the foode, wherwith they pasture thy shepe, is the drowsye dreams and idle imaginacions of Antichriste.

"In stead of the preachyng of thy lyuely worde, the fede thy flocke wythe latin mumblynges, wythe dume Images wyth Hethnyshe cerymonies wyth vayne syghtes, and suche other apysh toys.

"In sted of the ministracion of the holy and blessed Communion the fede thy shepe wythe vile stynckyng, abhominable deulyshe, blasphemus & Idolatryous Masses.

"And vnto thes vnwholsome and pestilent and poysonfull pastures the dryue thy shepe, wyll they nyl they. & if any of thy flocke refuse to come and taste of those their pestilent poysons & poisonful pestilences, him they accite to appere befor that greate wolfe, whose face

is lyke vnto the face of a she beare that is robbed of her younge ones, whose eyes continually burne withe the vnquencheable flames of the deadly cockatrice, whose teethe are lyke to the venomous toshes of the rampyng lyon, whose mouth is full of cursed speaking & bitternes, whose tong speakithe extrem blasphemes agaynst the & thy holy annointed, whose lippes ar ful of deadly poisonne, whose throte is an open sepulchre, whose breathe fomethe & bloweth out threatenyng & slaughter agaynst the disciples of the Lorde, whose harte without ceasyng imaginethe wickednes, whose handes haue a delighte to be embrued with the bloode of the Sainctes, whose fete are swifte to shed bloode, whose whole manne bothe bodye and soule go alwaies vp & down musyng of myschyff.

"This wolfe, o Lorde, is so arrogante, haultie and prowde, seyng the gouernement of the whole Realme is committed vnto hym, that he hathe caste awaie all feare of the. He makethe boste off hys awne witte learnyng and pollecye. His wayes are alwaye fylthye. thy iudgementes are farre out of his syghte, he defyethe all hys enemies, For he saythe in his hearte: tushe, I shal never be caste downe, theyr shall no harme happen vnto me. He syttethe lurking lyke a lyon in his denne, that he maie priuely murther the innocent & sucke hys bloode.

"Whan suche, o Lorde God, as will not obeye their popish and deuelyshe procedyngs, are broughte before that grevous wolffe, they are miserably taunted, mocked, schorned blasphemed, as thi derely beloued sone was in Bishope Caiphas howse, and afterwarde cruely committed to preson, to the towre, to the flete, to the marshalseas, to the kynges benche, to the Counters, to Lollardes towre, to Newgate &c. Where they are kepte as shepe in a pynnefolde appointed to be slayne.

"And as thys cruel and bloudy wolf dealeth with the poore lambes, euen so do the residue of that letcherous litture. He with all other of that wolfyshe kynde, hunger and thyrste nothing so greatly, as the deuouring of the bodies, and the sucking of the bloude of thy poore and innocent lambes.

"Ah, Lorde, whyle the vngodly haue the ouerhande, the poore are moste wretchedly handled. They are prayes vnto the wolfes.

"Arise, therefore, o Lorde God, lyfte vp thine hande, and forget not the poore, whiche geueth them selfe ouer into thy hande, and committeth hym vnto thy defence. Breake thou the arme of the vngodly and malicious, search out the wickednes, whiche he hath done, that he may shortly perish from the lande of the living." —*Sig.* C. vii.

"Thou callest thy self a iealous God, why than doest thou suffer thy people, thy congregacion, thy flocke, thyne heritage, to be thus seduced & ledde awaye from the vnto all kynde of spiritual fornication, and abhominable whordome by that Antichriste of Rome, that greate Baal, that stoute Nemroth, that fals prophet, that beast, that whore of Babylon, that sonne of perdicion, and by hys abhominable adherentes, Cardinalles, Archebisshoppes, Bisshoppes, Suffraganes, Archedeacons, Deanes, Prouostes, Prebendaries, Commissaries, Parsonnes, Vicares, Purgatorierakers, Priestes, Monkes, Friers, Chanons

Nonnes, Anckers, Anckresses, Pardonners, Proctors, Scribes, Officialls, Sonners, Lawers, Massemongers, Canonisters, Papistes, Antichristes, Mammonistes, Epicures, Libertines, with all the rable of beastlye hypocrites that haue receued the beastes mark, which do nothing els than seke, how they may establishe their Antichristian kyngdom, by suppressinge thy holy worde, and leadinge thy people into all kynde of blyndenes, errours and lyes.

"Thou callest thy self a Lorde, and thou sayeste, that thou wilt gyue thy glory to none other, nor thy grayse vnto grauen Images, howe commeth it than to passe, that thou suffrest thy glory so too decaye in the realme of Englande, so many to steale awaye thy prayse and honoure, by sayenge their idolatrous and deuelishe masses, by ministeringe a sorte of Heythenish and Jewishe ceremonies, by prayenge vntoo dead sainctes, by blottinge oute of the temples, thy holy lawe there written, according to thy commaundement, for the edifyenge of thy people, and by settinge vp in the steade therof Idols and Mawmettes, cleane contrary to thy blessed worde?

"Thou callest thyself a Lyon & a consuming fyre and threatenest vtter destruccion vnto thin aduersaries, whi suffereth thou than these Antichristes thus to ryse, rore, & rage, against the testament of thy most dere sonne, to beat doune thy trueth, to call thy holy lawe heresy, to banishe the preachinge of the Gospel, and the true vse of the Sacramentes, & to seke the destruccion of so many as vnfaynedly loue the and thy blessed worde."—*Sig.* A. iv. *b.*

"Thus seist thowe (O moste mercifull father) Howe miserabli the face of the Chryste common weale of England is beyond all measure defamed.

"Thus seist thoue, howe thy godly doctrine and most holy ordinances are vtterly abolyshed, and menes tradicions set vp in the place of them.

"Thus seist thowe, howe thy glorie & honore that is due to the alone is attributed and geuene to an Idole of bread and to their wicked Maumets.

"Thus seist thowe, howe the Saluacion, whiche is thorow faithe to be hoped & looked for onlye in the glorious passion, precius deathe, & triumphant Resurrecion of thy most dere son and our alone Sauiour & Lord Jesus Christ is nowe reposed in the sinfull merites of hipocrites, in the intercession of Saintes, in ceremonies, in the obseruances of menes idle imaginacions &c.

"Thus seist thow, how thy holy worde is set aside, and mans doctrin hathe the vppermost hand.

"Thus seist thow how thy holy mysteries are to moch filtheli defiled of the swynyshe Papistes.

"Thus seist thowe, howe all thynges in the temples be done without edifieng. Nothyng is herad in them but boyng, bellowyng and blearing (*sic*).

"Thus seist thowe, howe the fatherli Bishoppes and faithfull pastores are vniustli put out of their cures, depriued of all that they haue, banyshed and handled like shepe appoynted to the slaughter, and in the steade off them whyte dawbed walles, paynted Sepulckers

full of all filthines & abhominacion, blynde Phareseis, subtile Hypocrites, vnlearned asses, Romyshe foxes, Rawenyng wolues, Lordly Tyrantes, and such Lyke pestilences are appoynted to rule ouer thy flocke."—*Sig.* D. ii.

"And that thy blessed worde may haue the more fre passag, take away from vs those Idolatrus Massmongers, those idle latyne Mumblers, those shauen Madianites, those Lordly loyterers, those Wolues, those Theues, Robbers, and Murtherars, whiche do nothyng elles than poyson thy flocke, whom thy moste dere Sonne purchased withe hys moste Precious dere hearte bloode, and mak hawocke of thy sely simple shepe by leadyng them awaye frome the, throwe their vayne sophistrie vnto the Dewill & the pope, from thy holy worde and blessed ordenances vnto the trifeling tradicions & croked yea cankered constitucions of Hipocrites: And in the stead of them place thow godly Byshopes, learned Preachers, Christen Ministers, faithful teachers, True spirituall Fathers, Louyng pastors euen suche as will diligently seke vpe the loste shepe, whom the woulyshe Papistes in the tyme of their tiranny haue most wrechedli scattered abrode."—*Sig.* D. vi.

But though I have thought it necessary to give these extracts relating to the change of religion in the country, and illustrating the mode in which that subject was treated by the writers of the Puritan party, yet they would do very imperfect justice to that part of the subject. There was another method of treating the matter which requires more particular notice, and of which I hope to speak in a separate essay.

ESSAY X.

THE PURITAN PALINODIA.

"THE HARBOROUGH FOR FAITHFUL SUBJECTS."

WHEN the preceding essay went to the press it was my intention to proceed immediately to the consideration of what may be called the popular course pursued by the puritan party with regard to the change of religion in England. Argument is a fine thing for fine people; and learning is better than house or land, especially for those who possess the means of comparison, and are therefore best qualified to judge of relative values. But where the energies of the million are wanted there is a more compendious

and effective method of rousing them, and one that was appreciated and well understood by the parties with whose proceedings we are concerned. It is indeed a curious matter, and one which has been, as far as I know, very little noticed. At all events it has not received the attention which it deserves. But as it is one which extends over a considerable period, and comprehends a good deal of matter, it has appeared to me best to say a few words on a point relating more immediately to the exiled party, while some of their proceedings having been recently subjects of discussion, are fresh in remembrance.

I have given copious specimens of the doctrine propounded or sanctioned by Knox, Goodman, Whittingham, Kethe, Traheron, Becon, and others, on the subject of female monarchy. I have shown the grounds on which these leading men of the party denounced it as "monstruous," and I am not aware that as long as Queen Mary lived any one of them, or of their party, published one word of reply, or repudiation. It is obvious, therefore, that when they came to see the lady Elizabeth actually stepping into the throne, they must have felt themselves in an awkward predicament.

To refer to no other points which had been discussed, she was a woman as well as her sister; and no one who has read the foregoing pages can doubt that she would consider many of the passages which I have quoted, as capable of a very clear and unpleasant application to herself. Of course, if Mary was a thing accursed because she was a woman, so was Elizabeth; and if the "regiment" of one of these creatures was "monstruous," so would be that of the other. It must have puzzled the party extremely; and we cannot doubt that it was the subject of much thought and consultation; and judging from the result, we may suppose that they who were most concerned in the matter came to a decision that, as what had been done could not be undone, and what had been said could not be unsaid, it would be best to put a good face on the matter—to throw John Knox, the most violent and notorious maintainer of the opinion, overboard at once and for ever—to say as little as possible about the way in which the subject had been treated by Goodman and others, of whom it could not be pretended that they were "Scots" and "straungers"—and to say as much as could be said in the way of denial, explanation, apology, contradiction, &c.,

by the pen of some staunch member of the party, who was not particularly and personally committed on the subject of female goverment. Happily for their need, they had among them a man "sharp in his discourse, facetious, bold, free in speech, blunt in words, stout and courageous;" and it does credit to their sagacity, or his, that he was immediately in the field as the champion of the party.

Surely there was something chivalrous in the act; for it was not as if he had turned round upon his old friends; and though the business which he undertook naturally reminds one of

"the valiant rat
Who undertook to bell the cat,"

yet he really is not to be accused of anything like what is called "ratting," even allowing to that term all the improper latitude with which it is nowadays employed. I do not know that he said a word which could inculpate or disparage any one of his friends, or noticed any one word, written or spoken on the awkward subject with which he had to deal, except the "lytle booke strangely vvritten by a straunger;" and supposing this to have been entirely his own doing, it certainly was, all things considered, very creditable to him. Every one must be glad to know something of one who performed so singular a feat; and it is curious that, but for what seems in human estimation a very casual and trifling circumstance, very little would have been recorded of a man who is not known to have written any thing but this small book, now seldom heard of, and more rarely seen. But as to the man himself, what library is without his "Life and Acts," a volume "wherein are explained many transactions 'of the Church of England, and what methods were then 'taken to preserve it, with respect both to the Papist and 'Puritan"?

Did the reader ever meet with a book intituled "Origines 'Literariæ; or a Treatise on the causes of Books; wherein 'is, by occasion, somewhat touched, the effect which such 'grounds and causes have had on the frame and tenor of the 'works themselves"? I never did; and I do not believe that there ever was such a thing; but I have often wished that there had been. It would be a most curious and valuable addition to literary history. In many cases we should learn how it happened that a certain author was led to take

up a certain subject, and to treat it in a certain way. We should sometimes find that it arose from no peculiar qualification or addiction, from no predilection, no particular knowledge of the subject or notion of its importance, but from some accidental circumstances which have never been generally known, or have become quite forgotten; and which, nevertheless, if present to the mind of the reader, would prepare him better than any other preface for the perusal of the work, and greatly help him to understand and appreciate it[1].

[1] Perhaps there are few better specimens than Limborch's History of the Inquisition. It is so long since I looked at the history of that work that I do not recollect the minute particulars, but I think that "The Book of Sentences" came into the hands of Locke, during his secession on the continent towards the end of the seventeenth century. This book, being an undoubtedly genuine document, containing the proceedings of the Inquisition at Toulouse, for about sixteen years (1307—1323), was very properly considered a great curiosity; but, I apprehend, that so far as history and truth were concerned, it might have lain obscure, if it had not seemed probable that it might do some good in the way of political agitation. Whether it did, or did not, in fact, people would suppose that it must, contain such revelations of a mystery of iniquity as would be appalling. At all events it would offer a good opportunity for exciting public feeling on the subject, and for any declamation that might be desirable. Who would read the original dog-latin document of four hundred close printed folio pages? In the hundred and fifty years since it was published who *has* read it? I verily believe no one individual. Gibbon looked at it, and lamented that it had not had a more learned and critical editor; but no matter for that; Limborch was a man of the right sort, which was much more important than that he should know about the Inquisition. So he made a great book, and prefixed a fierce dedication to Archbishop Tillotson assuring his Grace, and all other readers, in great words, and great letters, that he had in the great book thoroughly exposed Popery in its true colours, and that they might make up their minds on that subject, before they set out on their journey of some eight hundred folio pages of Latin, supposing that they had any idea of encountering that fatigue. What was to have been an introductory Treatise to "The Book of Sentences" grew, as the author learned his lesson, into the more ambitious form and title of "Historia Inquisitionis." "This History," says his biographer Morgan (in Aikin's General Biography), "he 'executed with such ability that Mr. Locke, that incomparable judge of 'men and books, pronounced it to be a work in its kind, ABSOLUTELY 'PERFECT. And in a Letter to Mr. Limborch himself" [though not perhaps intended to be quite private and confidential] "he told him that he 'had so fully exposed the Inquisitors' secret arts of wickedness and 'cruelty, that if they had any remains of humanity in them, they must 'be ashamed of that horrid tribunal, in which every thing that was just 'and righteous was so monstrously perverted; and that it ought to be 'translated into the vulgar language of every nation, that the meanest

I remember being once asked by the man to whom of all others I should have looked for an answer to the question, "How came Strype to write the life of Bishop Aylmer?" I could not tell; and I suspect that not one reader in ten could assign any specific reason that would satisfy his own mind. Of course, if he has Strype's preface by heart, he

'persons" [the best judges in such a case] "might understand the anti-'christian practices of that execrable court." As to the original cause of all, "The Book of Sentences" itself; the sequel of its history is amusing and fortunate, and I hope I shall be pardoned if I seem to go a little out of the way to record the pious care of Archbishop Secker, of which, I believe, no man has so much right or so much reason to speak as myself. While he was bishop of Oxford, he was informed that the manuscript, which had served its turn, was for sale, and he was pressed to buy it lest (of all things in the world) it should fall into the hands of the Roman Catholics, who would of course be on the watch to seize and destroy such a witness against them. One is glad that it should have been bought, though it seems to have been under a delusion; for, unless misled by popular clamour, no Romanist could have wished that book to be destroyed. I think Mr. (afterwards Bishop) Butler was the negociator; but any reader who likes may see all the particulars for himself. They were preserved by the care and business-like habits of Secker, and are deposited with the Manuscript in the British Museum.

But to come to the point for which this History of the Inquisition is here referred to. Whatever Mr. Locke and his party might say of the book, and whatever face the author might put upon the matter in his dedication to the liberal Primate of England, Limborch was quite sensible that he had got out of his latitude. In the letter which he sent to Dr. Spencer (then the Head of C. C. College, Cambridge, but best known now as the writer *De Legibus Hebræorum*, &c.), and which is among the MSS. at Lambeth, he acknowledges to his learned friend with admirable simplicity, that he had allowed himself to be drawn into a matter quite out of his way. That purposing to edit the Book of Sentences, he determined to prefix a dissertation on the Inquisition, but coming to look at the writers on that subject he found that there was so much to be said about it, that he had changed his mind and made a full History, though nothing could have been a greater bore to a person of his line of study than patching together the bits from various writers of which he made his book; but the book *was* made, and it is a great book, and a book of great authority. I suppose that similar apologetic letters were sent with it to other scholars, but as I am not aware that this one to Dr. Spencer has been printed I subjoin the beginning of it:—"In laborem a studiis meis 'plane alienum me pertrahi passus sum. Editurus Librum sententiarum 'Inquisitionis Tholosanæ dissertationem de Inquisitione præmittere sta-'tueram: Verum cum autores qui de Inquisitione scribunt evolverem 'adeo uberem deprehendi materiam ut mutato consilio integram Inqui-'sitionis Historiam conscripseram. Ego studio Theologico adsuetus mo-'lestissimam sane expertus sum lucubrationem quæ laciniarum ex variis 'autoribus conquisitarum et in aptum methodum congestarum, collectione 'constat," &c.—MS. No. 674.

may say that Bishop Aylmer was a prelate "within whose 'diocese lay both The Court, Westminster Hall, and Lon-'don, the great metropolis of the nation: and by whom the 'Archbishop of Canterbury passed all his injunctions and 'mandates to the rest of the bishops and clergy of his pro-'vince." All this is undoubtedly matter of fact; much of which may be proved by the maps of dioceses somewhile since published in the British Magazine; and so, perhaps, we may assent to the inference of the biographer when he adds;—"and therefore we may reasonably look for matters 'of great moment to be occasionally recommended to the 'Bishop in this busy reign, and to fall into the accounts we 'give of him." No doubt many things might be made to fall into the accounts of a man who lived from 1521 to 1594. Many matters of interest might be brought into a biography of Bow Bells, if it professedly included a full account of all that has happened within their sound; and a clever writer might make even the Life and Times of the Pump at Aldgate very lively, notwithstanding its stationary character, and the washy monotony of its involuntary performances. But we should be surprised to find any writer of such enlarged views choosing such a nucleus; and it is much the same in the case of Strype's Life of Aylmer. It is curious to read his laboured preface intended to convince himself, and his readers, that it was very proper to write the work, and that it might be made interesting, and that if a biographer could not say a great deal, or what was so good as he might have wished, of a prelate whose diocese, locally considered, contained so much, yet still it was highly proper that the life should be written; and even if anybody should think that the biographer went out of his way in selecting "Queen Elizabeth's *third* Bishop of London," and passing over his predecessors, Grindall and Sandys, it was enough to say that it would be more proper to treat of them, if at all, as Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

But supposing Strype to have persuaded himself of all this, and believing, as I do, that he had not the least idea of anything like concealment or false colouring, it must be observed that the simple matter of fact which, it can scarcely be doubted, furnished the chief reason for writing the book, is not once hinted at throughout the preface; and is one

which the shrewdest reader of the preface would never guess. It does not come out, I believe, until Strype has told the whole history of the prelate's life, and proceeds to speak of his descendants. It then appears that Bishop Aylmer married Judith Buers—that Samuel, the eldest of their seven sons, married Ann, daughter of Lord Brabazon —that Anthony, the third son of this marriage, had a son named "Brabazon Aylmer, the bookseller and publisher of 'this book, who," Strype adds, "out of due and honourable 'respects to the memory of his great-grandfather the Bishop" [not of course with any eye to business] "put me 'upon exposing these collections, and communicated some 'considerable papers and notices relating hereunto."—p. 116. So that after all, though in Bishop Aylmer's time his diocese really did contain the Court, and Westminster Hall, and a world beside, yet if it had not long afterwards contained the "Three Pigeons over against the Royal Exchange," even like as the Three Pigeons contained, and were controlled by, his great-grandson Brabazon, Bishop Aylmer's life might never have been written. If Brabazon really prevailed on Mr. Strype to undertake the task of "exposing" his collections, (not to say the bishop,) from pious regard to his ancestor, he is to be commended and pitied; if it was done merely to get renown, or to turn a penny by the family papers, one can only wish that his great-grandfather had been at hand to have "soundly cudgelled him for his baseness," as he did his son-in-law—the unhappy "divine and preacher," Dr. Squire, who had married and ill treated his daughter, the great-aunt of the said Brabazon.

But so it is, that for some reason or other, the Life of Aylmer was written; and (to borrow Strype's words respecting a sermon preached at Paul's Cross by a son of "this loose man," Dr. Squire, who was cudgelled) it "hath a great deal of reading in it;" and some of the reading is very curious; but our particular business lies with that which concerns Aylmer's performances before his return from exile, and of course a good while (much longer than he liked) before he was a bishop. Strype tells us,

"When Queen Mary was extinct, whose reign was deeply besmeared with blood, and her sister Elizabeth, a lady of other principles, succeeded to the crown, Aylmer with the rest of the exiles

came home to their native country, with no little joy and thankfulness to God, to enjoy the quiet profession of that religion they had suffered for before, and endured the loss of all. But before he returned home he printed an English book at Strasburgh, called 'An Harborough for faithful Subjects,' (an account whereof is given towards the conclusion of the book;) which he wrote upon a consultation, as it seems, holden among the exiles, the better to obtain the favour of the new Queen, and to take off any jealousy she might conceive of them and the religion they professed, by reason of an ill book a little before set forth by Knox, a Scotchman and fellow exile; who had asserted therein, that it was unlawful for women to reign, and forbid by God in his word. This doctrine was seasonably confuted by Aylmer, and learnedly. And for Queen Elizabeth, he gave her a great character, concluding that there would be all peace and prosperity under a princess of such admirable parts and godly education."—p. 11.

Most of this is true as to the facts. With a degree of assurance which has perhaps never been equalled, and which, even with the book before one, seems hardly credible, Aylmer undertook to refute the "lytle booke strangely written by a straunger." He had, as has been already hinted, some personal qualifications for the work—being (as we may learn among other things from the "Contents" of Strype's biography) "zealous for the true religion . . . . 'diligent and painful. Not to be tempted by bribes . . . . 'quick and hot in his temper . . . . sharp in his discourse '. . . . facetious . . . . Bold. Free in speech. Blunt in 'words. Stout and courageous . . . . a man of both for-'tunes;" by which last characteristic Strype seems to have meant much the same as Dogberry did when he spake of "a fellow that hath had losses"—but beside these personal qualifications, which do not meet in every man, there was one circumstance which renders it probable that he was rightly selected as "the most desartless man to be constable," and carry the lantern on this occasion. He had been tutor to the Lady Jane Grey; and it is but charitable to believe that among the bull-dog virtues for which his biographer vouches (to say nothing of that eye to his own interest which seems to have been as sharp, as it was near, sighted) he had so much fidelity as, if it did not fully and indissolubly unite him in the fortune of his ill-fated pupil, yet so far committed him as that it would have been impossible for him (or at least for anybody else in his circumstances) to have denounced the regiment of women. I do not know where

he was, or what he was doing, during the few days that Queen Jane was on the throne, or why he felt it necessary to fly the country after her deposition; but it is only justice to him to say that if he had merely come forward to disavow for himself the opinions maintained by Knox, he could not, as far as appears, have been charged with inconsistency, or any fault except that which he himself suggests as apt to be laid to the charge of all those who under particular circumstances allow opinions to circulate without public contradiction.

Indeed it would seem as if it was chiefly to this point that he felt called upon to address himself; for what had he and his companions to do with the thoughts or works of a "Scot," and a "straunger," except that they had unluckily and unaccountably let the time run on without expressing their abhorrence of them until Queen Elizabeth was actually on the throne? For his own part, "chaunsing upon a boke" of such a nature, for it would appear that his coming to know of it was quite accidental—"happening," as he says, "not long agone" to read *this* book—he "wished that some notable learned man would haue answered it," and was only hindered from doing it himself by the expectation that some more competent person would undertake the task. But it is impossible to do the writer justice except in his own words. In his dedication, which is "To the right honorable and his 'singuler good lordes, Francis Earle of Bedford, one of the 'Quenes Maiesties priuie Counsell, and the Lord Robert 'Duddeley, Master of her highnes horsse and Knight of the 'honorable order of the Garter," he says, after enumerating 'the heretical sects of antiquity—

"And in these our latter daies, the old festred sores newly broken out, as the Anabaptistes, the freewillers, or rather frowardewillers, the iusticiaries, &c., and others that be new, as Adiaphoristes, Oserianistes, Maroranistes, Papists, with infinit other swarms of gods enemies, by whom our aduersari Satan seketh to disturb the true vnitie of Christes church, to choke the good corn of late sown in gods field, and to dim that excellent lighte, whiche according to his secreate counsell and decree, he determined shuld shine to the vnspeakable comfort of his elect, in these our dais. Among these vgglie monsters and brodes of the deuils brotherhead, hath of late krept out, I can not tel whether by wil or ignorance certain πολιφθάρματα which haue called into question among vs such thinges as good subiectes before neuer doubted of, *whether it wer lawful for women, inheritours of kingdoms, to gouern and guid the same, or no.*

"Although this error may appeare, not to touch so neare the soule and saluacion of man, as some of the forenamed do: yet considering that the quiet of common weales is the nurse of religion, and bulwark of good and faithful men; and that the apostle pronounceth against the rebellious vtter damnacion; we can not think it to be a trifle to disturbe the common ordres of pollicies, to sondre the mindes of subiectes, by new inuented contrauersies, and briefly to make men to muse, of that they neuer before mistrusted. Wherfor chaunsing vpon a boke, about a yere past, intitled 'THE FIRST BLAST,' conteining new broched doctrine to disproue the regiment of women. After I had red it, I wished that some notable learned man, wold haue answered it, that, like as those which be stonge of Scorpions vse to fetch remeady of the same: so this cause being wounded, or rather a little scratted, with some shewe and apparance of learning: might be again healed with suche plaisters as through the truthe of the matter, true lerning ministreth. And for as much as I hoped of this at som mens hands, and hard of one, which is now gon to God, that he had taken it vpon him, I ment not my self for a time to medle with it, least that a good cause by il handling shuld, in the iudgment of som, seme the worse. But whan the length of time taught me that he that ment it was taken from it, and such as could haue throughly don it, made no hast to it: I thoughte it better rather by my sclendre handling of it to shew mi good wil, than by the common silence to seme to winke at it. And so much the rather I toke it in hand, because, if no man shuld do it, all our side shuld seme to bear with it; which I knowe to be so far of, that NONE *that I know* (*I speak of the learned*) *be further gilty in this poynt, than that by ther declaration they haue not shewed themselues giltles.* I know the credit, the old prouerb hath, *qui tacet consentire videtur*, he that winketh at a matter, semeth to think the same. And therfore as it was necessary that som in the behalf of al, shuld vtter the minds of the rest, so ment I, though more boldly then wisely, yet not so rashly as necessarily, nor as I trust more rudely then profitably, to let the world vnderstand that this infection is not blown in by the blast to al mens breasts, yea I dare be bold to saye that *al the best learned be of the same iudgement* herein that this my simple treatise shall vtter me to be of. So that neither our sworn enemies the papists shal haue any longer leasure to belie vs, nor our half frends which are indifferent to beleue any thing of vs, hereafter to mistrust vs, nor the highe powers them selues in this point to feare vs. We haue lerned and taught, we loue and like, we honor and esteme true obedience to the high ministres of God; and, on the contrarye, we can no skil of seditious disturbers of wel satled policies of rashe vnbrideled brekers of holsome and godlye lawes. Thus me thinke I may saye *in the name of al*, because *I know the contrary opinion to be in fewe or none.* Wherfore let our enemies leaue of thus to charge vs, in that we deserue not, and our frindes to mistrust vs, in that they certainlye knowe not, or els they shall be reproved of loude lying, and these of to vnfrendly misiudging."—*Pref. Sig.* A. iij.

And this is followed up on the first page of his book, thus;—

"And as in great Cities, great hede is geuen, that neither by negligence of the Citezins, nor malice of euil vvillers, it be consumed by fyre, or hurt by any other casualtie, so in common vvelthes must it be prouided, that no fyre brandes of Sedicion be cast into the houses of mens hartes, to impayre thobedience of good Subiectes, to kindle the harts of the frovvard, and to destroy honest, godly, and comly order. For mans nature being such, as it can hardly be brought to stupe, and easely stirred vp to disturbe, all occasions must be cut of, vvherby the euyll may be encoraged to cast of the yocke of obedience, and the simple brought into doubt vvhat thei ought to followv. Happening therfore not longe agone to rede a lytle booke strangely vvritten by a Straunger, to proue that the rule of VVomen is out of Rule, and not in a common vvelte tollerable: And vvaying at the first vvhat harm might come of it, and felying at the last that it hath not a lytle vvounded the conscience of some symple, and almost cracked the dutie of true Obedience: I thought it more then necessary to lay before mens eyes the vntruth of the argument, the vvekenes of the proufes, and the absurditie of the vvhole. In the siftyng vvherof, I mynde to vse suche modestie, that it shall appere to all indifferent men, that I seke to defend the cause, and not to deface the man; Seing this errour rose not of malice but of zele, and by loking more to the present crueltie, that then vvas used: then to the inconuenience that after might followv." —*Sig.* B.

It is, indeed, probable that if Knox had been aware of the "inconvenience that after might follow," he would not have said some things which he did say; but is quite clear that Aylmer, while he did not mean "to deface the man," meant to remove the "inconvenience" as much as possible from his own party, by repudiating the "straunger" and his performances.

But we come to the argument from authority and precedent—we soon see how easily two could play at that game. This "small but truly learned piece," as Strype calls it, shows that history is a witness whom it is sometimes worth while to cross-examine. It is curious to see how completely the *dramatis personæ* are changed. "Jolye Jesabel," and wicked Athalia, and Herodias, and all the bad women who had been congregated, are disbanded and sent about their business—they are straunge women, and may go with the "straunger," and he may make what he can of them—*exeunt omnes*, and enter Deborah, and Judith, and Esther, and Theodora, and all the mothers in Israel that could be collected on short notice; and doubtless nothing but want of time hindered

the mention of Hannah More and Mrs. Fry. How happy would the latter have been to be placed beside the "fyrst preacher" to the Samaritans.

But this is rather anticipating. Aylmer, as will be seen, was far from maintaining that women generally, and as such, were stronger and wiser than men; but then he marvelled how any man could fail to see that it had ever been the divine pleasure to choose weak things to confound those which were mighty. Whether he was not rather too "diligent and painful," (to borrow Strype's words,) as well as "free in speech," in working out this argument may, perhaps, be doubted. Notwithstanding abundance of that gross flattery which she loved, it may be questioned whether this line of argument could be rendered altogether agreeable to the Queen. Her highness did not perhaps receive unmixed gratification from comparisons, or even illustrations, founded on the ass of Balaam, the jaw-bone of Sampson, the earthen pots of Gideon, and other "moste base meanes" and "folyshnes" by which wonderful works have been wrought. One would like to know how she looked and felt while reading the following passages:—

"Placeth he a vvoman vveake in nature, feable in bodie, softe in courage, vnskilfull in practise, not terrible to the enemy, no shilde to the frynde, vvel, *Virtus mea* (saith he) *in infirmitate perficitur*. My strengthe is moste perfight vvhen you be moste vveake; if he ioyne to his strengthe, she can not be vveake; if he put to his hande, he can not be feable; if he be vvith her, vvho can stande against her? Thou shalt not take vvith the any great povver (saith he to Gedeon) lest you thinke to ouercome your enemies by your own strength, and provves, and not by my vvurking and might. It is as easy for him to saue by fevve as by many, by vveake as by strong, by a vvoman as by a man. Yea his moste vvonderfull vvorkes are alvvayes vvrought in oure moste vveakenes, as infinite examples and testimonies do shevve."—*Sig.* B. ii. *b.*

"He saued his people by the hande of a vvoman poore Deborah. He aduanced them and ouerthrevve the enemies by a poore shepherde and his sling. He cut of the head of the proude captayne Olophernes by the hande of a vveake vvoman. It vvas, in reason a poore helpe to Sampsons strengthe, a nomber of heares grovving vpon his hed, or an Asses iavve bone in his hande, to destroye so many enemies and bring the people to libertie. The breaking of. 300, earthen pottes, vvas a sclender pollycie to make so many Myriades to flee and one to kille another."—*Sig.* B. iii. *b.*

"VVas not Quene Anne the mother of this blessed woman, the chief, first, and only cause of banyshing the beast of Rome, vvith all

his beggerly baggage? vvas there euer in Englande a greater feate vvrought by any man, then this vvas by a vvoman? I take not from kyng Henry the due praise of broching it, nor from that lambe of God king Edvvard, the finishing and perfighting of that vvas begon, though I giue hir, hir due commendacion. I knovv that that blessid martir of God Thomas Cranmer byshop of Canterbury, did much trauaile in it, and furthered it: but if God had not gyuen Quene Anne fauour in the sight of the kynge, as he gave to Hester in the sight of Nabucadnezar, Haman, and his company, the Cardinall, VVynchester, More, Roches: and other, vvold sone haue trised vp Mardocheus vvith al the rest that leaned to that side. VVherfore though many deserued muche praise for the helping forvvarde of it: yet the croppe and roote vvas the Quene, whiche God had endevved vvith vvisdome that she coulde, and gyuen hir the minde that she vvould do it. Seing then that in al ages God hath vvroughte his moste vvonderfull vvorkes, by moste base meanes: and shevved his strengthe by vveakenes, his vvisdome by folyshnes, and his exceding greatnes by mans exceding feblenes, VVhat doubt vve of his povver, vvhen vve lacke pollycie, or mistrust his helpe vvhich hath vvrought suche vvounders? VVho is placed aboue him saieth Iob: to teach him vvhat he shuld do? Or who can say to him, thou hast not don iustly? He sendeth a vvoman by birth, vve may not refuse hir by violence. He stablissheth her by lavve, vve may not remoue hir by vvronge. He maketh hir a head, vve may not make hir a hande or foote."—*Sig.* B. iv. *b*.

"Now thou seest, good reader," says our author (after some time spent in discussing history from the Old Testament) "howe this matter stode among the Iewes;"—and of course there is not so much difficulty about "poore Deborah" and the rest of her nation; but when he comes to "run over a few recordes in like manner, among the Christians," some qualification and explanation are required; for beginning with Theodora, he is obliged to confess that "she was superstitious and wilfull (through the lewde perswasions of her clatteringe Clargie, in the defence of images)"—but then as he says:—

"VVherfore, though there be some faultes to be found in this Theodora, and other: yet proueth it not that thei may not reigne, for it is a *fallax ab accidente* to say, she was nought, ergo, she might not rule; for that hangeth not vpon the rule, that she was nought, but vpon the persone. As if you should saye, my L. lubber of London is a tyraunt: ergo he is no bysshop. I warrant you, though he graunted you the antecedent whiche he can hardly denie: yet he would denye the consequent, or els he would call for wylie VVatson to helpe him. In Fraunce, tyl of late yeares, women enherited the crown as in Englande, and Scotlande, vntil that they ment by the lawe salique, rather to defeate vs of our title, then to condempne the succession as vnlaufull, as you may now see by the

Frenche king. He neither thynketh it vnlaufull or vnnaturall to be lorde of your contrie by that womans tytle. I woulde you coulde perswade either him or your countrey men, to thinke that the quenes title bycause she is a woman is vnlaufull, and so do your own countrey good first, and let vs alone with ours. And as you speede there, you might perchaunce encourage vs to follow when it may be done laufully. Tully saith, *ne sis curiosus in aliena rep.* The voyce of a straunger, is to be hard in the pulpit, so long as he speaketh Gods worde: But a straungers voyce is not alowed *in foro*, in the parliament about pollycie, bycause he is not a citezen. This I saye not to philip you, as though you ment euil to vs (for I am perswaded that you loue England as well as your own contrey) but I meane to monish you, that being a straunger you disturbe not our state: lest you giue occasion to them that know you not, of suspicion. It is a great enterprise (and as they say no balle playe) to pulle a quenes crowne of his (*sic*) head: and specially such a ones, as many ages haue not sene, nor many countreis enioyed, or many histories recorded the lyke. I would not be wounded in conscience, with any attempte against hir, if I might be lord of all that Philippe, and the french king haue. VVel, I must leaue hir for this tyme, lest the remembraunce of her vertues make me to forget my matter."—*Sig.* F. i. *b.*

There is something propitiatory in the idea of the writer's being carried away from his subject by the remembrance of the Queen's virtues; and especially in seeing (if her majesty ever did see) that nothwitstanding his consciousness that it interrupted his argument, and his good resolution to avoid it, he so soon fell again and more deeply into the same error. In fact it seemed as if he was so fascinated that he could not keep out of it. In the course of a very few pages he says—

"Vndoubtedly in the whole number of men, might be founde some one that shoulde in all respectes passe the beste among women in wisdome, grauite, learning, vnderstanding, sobrietie, temperauncie, hablenes to take paines, warlykenes, iustice, fortitude, &c. But when it standeth in no mans election, but in his hande that shapeth male or female in the wombe of the mother at his pleasure: Then hath mans voyce no authoritie bycause he hath gyuen ouer his right in chusing by common consent vnto God, that he according to his inscrutable wysdome may chuse and dispose as he pleaseth. This being doone, shall man pull back his graunt, or call God to accompt and say, 'Nay when we agreed, the matter should be referred to your iudgement, we ment not that you should send vs a women to rule ouer vs: or we had forgette to put that in the condicions, and therfore you must geue vs leaue to reuoke our graunt, for we can prouide better than thus, our selfes.' VVere not this a folyshe plea (thinke you) and a mad enterprise? wold he not sone aunswer vs, 'Oh you presumptuous fooles, that haue suche opinion of your own wyt: who made empires and kyngdomes,

dominions and rules? who preserueth and mainteineth them? whose be they? yours or myne? must you haue the orderyng or I? If they bee myne why let you me not alone with them? If they be yours: shewe your euidence howe you came by them: shall not I do with myne what I liste? Is therfore your eye ill because I am good? Murmur ye at myne anoynted, because she is a woman? who made man and woman, you or I? yf I made hir to lyue: may I not make her to reigne? If I apoynt hir to the office? can I not adourne hir, and make hir hable to discharge it? VVhy then (you of litle faithe) eyther feare you my good wil, or mistrust you my power? you are muche worse then Saule in this poynte, whome I reiectyd for disobedience. For when I sent my seruaunt Dauid, yonge of age, and no Gyante in stature, with his shepe hoke and his slyng: Saule woulde haue armed hym wyth hys owne armoure? But when Dauid threwe it of and wente his waye naked against his enemye, a great hyghe monstre, in comparison of hym, Saule mystrusted not as you do: murmured not as you doo, sayinge, 'Ah this poore boye is not hable to be our champion, and to defende our libertie;' but he prayed for him, and wyshed him well in the name of Iehouah the lorde of hostes. It is, I tell you, all one to me, to saue with many or few, with armour or without, by a woman or by a man. VVhat letteth, that she may not as well represent my maiestie, as any of you all? If I be best represented by the shining ornamentes of the mynde, and not the outwarde sturdines of the body: why may not she haue at my hande that any of you haue? wisdom to gouerne, iustice to punish, clemencie to pardon, discrescion to iudge. I that coulde make Daniel a sucking babe, to iudge better then the wisest of the lawyers: A brute beaste to reprehende the follie of a Prophet: and poore fisshers, to confound the great clarkes of the worlde, can not I make a woman to be a good ruler ouer you, and a mete minister for me? VVhat vnlykelihod se you in hir? are your eyes so dulle? or your myndes so malycious? that you can not or wyll not see those Iewelles, wherwith I haue decked hir? is that rare learning, that singulare modestie, that heauenly clemencie, that christiane constancie, that loue of religion, that excellent wysdom with many more of my graces, nothing in your sight? I shewed you the lyke towarde in a man of late: but for your owne vnworthines, I toke him from you: And wil you, nowe I haue geuen you this, make yourselues vnworthy to enjoy hir? Leaue of, leaue of, your owne pollycie, which is but folly, and embrace my ordinaunce, as it is your dutie. For I pulle down whome I will, and set vp whome I wil.'

"Though God speaketh not thus to vs audibely: yet suer, he nedes must thus speake in our conscience inwardly. VVherfore let vs leaue of to dispute, and beginne to praye, that it maye please hym to stablyshe hir seat amonge vs, and to send hir longe lyfe and quiet reigne, to defende hir and vs from inuasions abrode and conspiracies at home, to giue hir grace to seeke his honour, and maynteine the truthe, to guide hir harte in the choise of hir husbande, and to make her frutefull, and the mother of manye chyldren, that thys Realme maye haue the graftes of so goodly a tree, That oure chyldren and posterite maye see hirs occupying hir

throne, with honour, ioye, and quietnes. The remembraunce of her vertues carieth me awaye from my matter: wherefore I return."—*Sig.* I.

This passage of involuntary gratulation has a pithy side note in the margin—"VVe must praye for the Quene's estate and not dispute of hir right"—but perhaps there is no one passage in the book more observable, both on account of the gross flattery which it contains, and of the coarse (one would think unwelcome and disgusting) ribaldry by which it is accompanied, than the following, of which Strype has quoted a part:—

"The ii. reason out of Esay maketh as muche as for debarringe of yonge Princes rule, as Ioas, Iosias and our swiet kinge Edwarde (as his sister Marye helde) as it dothe againste women, for they be ioigned together, but in dede it maketh againste neither. For Esaye being worthelye called the Demosth: of the Hebrues, vseth suche goodly figures of speaking, as all the scripture hathe not beside, as in this place, I will take from you your honerable Senators, and your wise counselers, and I will geue you boyes and women, or effeminate persons to reigne ouer you, not boyes in age but in maners (as Aristotle saithe of yonge men, that to heare Philosophie it maketh no matter for their yeares, but for their maners) not women in sexe, but in feblenes of wit, and not suche as some women be, wiser, better learned, discreater, constanter, then a number of men: but such as women be of the vvurst sort, fond, folish, wanton, flibbergibbes, tatlers, triflers, wauering, witles, without counsell, feable, careles, rashe, proude, deintie, nise, talebearers, euesdroppers, rumour raisers, euell tonged, worse minded, and in euerye wise doltefied with the dregges of the Deuils dounge hill. As these minions be, such shall your senatoures and rulers be, that shall be neither hable to rule them selfes nor you. No Deborahes, no Judiths, no Hesters, no Elyzabethes. For sure wher such be: ther is no token of Gods wrath, whiche the Prophet threatneth here: but of gods fauoure, whereof we may be assured."—*Sig.* G. iii.

It may be doubted whether any man ever recommended himself to a woman by complimenting her at the expense of her sex. However, in this case, the compliments were only subordinate, or meant to be so, to the more important matters which Aylmer had in hand, and which were particularly two—first, to show that Elizabeth had a right to be Queen; and secondly, (not so plainly avowed, but obvious enough) that though her majesty as head of the church would have full right to do every thing that was to be done in it, in her own proper person, yet she could not be expected, and would not in fact be able, to do all the work

of the bishops and clergy, and must have a body of men in some shape, and under some name or other, to take their place, and perform their office. In a passage which has at the beginning the marginal note, "What is requyred in a pulpit man," and which after a few lines has another such note to the effect that "Preachers must be no milck soppes," he thus writes:—

"For in such as shall occupy the pulpit, is required these things, that they be mete to teach, to reproue, and conuince. In teaching is required grauitie, learning, and eloquence. In reprouinge courage and sounde iudgemente, and in conuincynge Artes, memorye and muche science. And because the bringinge vppe of vvomenne, is commonlye suche, as they canne not haue theese thynges (for they bee not broughte vppe in learnynge in Scholes, nor trayned in disputacions; Or if they were yet because nature hathe made them softer and milder then menne, yet bee they not suche as are mete for that function.) Therfore be they vnmete for this calling.

"For those that be preachers, must be no mylke soppes, no white lyuered gentlemen, that for the frowning and cloudy countenaunce of euery man in authoritie, will leaue his tackle and crie *Peccaui*. They must be of such nature, as the Poet saieth of Crito, *in vultu grauitas, in verbis fides*. They may not be afrayed to rebuke the proudest, no not kynges and quenes so farfurth as the two tables reacheth. As we see in Samuel, Nathan, Elie, Jhon Baptist, and many other. They may not stoupe to euery mans becke, and study to please man more then God. If heresies arise, they must haue their tooles ready to mete with thaduersary and to ouerthrowe hym: whiche he can not haue, onles he haue trauayled in many sciences, harde and redde much, which thinges (because they be huswyues) women can not haue commonly, and therfore they be vnmete hereunto.

"Yea God knoweth so be many men to: for it is not inough for a man to tell a fayre tale in the pulpit, and when he commeth down is not able to defende it. If preachers and spirituall ministers be suche, where be we when we come to handgripes? They must not only florishe, but they must know their quarter strookes, and the waye how to defende their head, their head Christe I saye, and his crosse. And specially in these dayes, wherein Sathan spiting the happy grouthe and grenes of Gods field, soweth tares and fytches of heresies and sectes continually, to choke or to empayre the good corne if it may be.

"VVhat ennemies haue we of the Papistes? vnlearned thinke you? nay, who so encountereth with them, had nede haue his harnes wel bucked to hym, or he may chaunce to take a wipe. I would they were aswel mynded, as they be learned. VVhat saye you nowe to the Arrians? which suer, are lyke to enfect the best heads in Europe (I meane the Italyans) if God prouide not remedy. Shall it be easy thynke you for euery man to ioyne with them? I can not tell howe simple they be. But one man of that sect so

distourbed a whole vniuersitie in Germany, that all the learned men there, and the Prince himself, was not hable to scrape out that he had wickedly grauen. The Swingfieldians, the Maioranes, the Pelagians, the froward freewyll men, the Adiaphoristes, the Osdrianistes, the newe Marcionistes, the Anabaptistes, with infinite other swarms of Satanistes, do you thinke that euery pulpit man wyll be hable to aunswer them? I pray God there be many that can[2].

"I saye therfore because there is so muche required in a spirituall minister: that all men bee not mete for the office. And therfore that with good reason women bee debarred from it. Albeit, at some tymes it pleaseth God to vse their ministrie euen in this poynt, as the woman of Samaria, whiche was the fyrst preacher to hir cytezens of the Messias, and the women, the fyrst Apostles and messengers of the resurrection. And as we reade in the Ecclesiasticall historie, A certen woman vnder Const. Mag. was the Apostle of the Iberians, whiche turned first the Kynge and Quene, and then the whole countrey to the fayth of Christe. This coulde not be done without some talke in thassemblies, nor without a kynde of preachyng. Yea, Theodoretus sayeth, that she dyd preache to them: wherfore me thinke euen in this poynte wee must vse ἐπιεικεία a certen moderacion, not absolutelie and in euerye wyse to debarre them, herein (as it shall please God) to serue Christe. Are there not in Englande women thynke you, that for their learnynge and wysdome, coulde tell their householde and neighbours, as good a tale as the best Sir Ihon there? And what if by occasion, not by common office, they shoulde sumtyme make their neighbours partakers of their giftes: were it so heinous a matter?" —*Sig.* G. iv. *b.*

But of course such pulpit men could not be had without considerable expense; and, therefore, it was necessary to show her Majesty, not only that there were very fit persons who were willing and desirous to stir up the nation to provide her freely and amply with the means of paying all her servants, (bishops among the rest, if she chose to have any,) but also that these very fit men would take the office on very moderate terms. In a passage which has a side note informing the reader that "Obedience spryngeth from the hart," he says—

"The hart (I say) must be framed and brought into the circle of obedience: and then wyll all the reaste followe. Thy knee shall bowe, thy cap shall of, thy tongue shall reuerently speak of thy soueraign, when and wher thou oughtest. For lyke as the fountain being clear, or trobled, the water that goeth from it, must be good or bad: so the hearte beynge in order, the reaste canne not bee out of order. Thy tong must be dedicated to God, to speke wel and

[2] It might be some comfort to her Majesty to think that he could probably tell her of one.

reuerently of his minister; for els, as Salomon saith, he will make the birdes of the ayre to vtter thy rebellion.

"Furthermore, it is thy bounde duti to geue her, when she calleth for part of thi goods that as Demosth. saith, by parting with a little, thou maist keepe the whole. Is it not better to healpe the mother and mistres of thy country, with thy goods and body: then by withholding thy hande, and nigging, to make her not hable to kepe out thine ennemy? haddest thou rather that thy auncient ennemy, the proud french man, or vntrusty scot should come to ransake thy coffers, to deflour thy wife, to rauish thy daughters, to beat thy children's brains vpon the walles, to fire thy house, to spoile thy goodes, driue away thy cattle, enioy thine inheritaunce, cut thine own throte, and bring thy country to naughte: then that the Quenes officer should take the .20. parte of thy possessions, for thy defence?

"If thou wilt not haue these mischiefes to happen, thou must do thy dutye in paying with a franke and free hart, without grutching or groning, specially, seeing thou gatherest all that thou hast, in her peax. Shuldest thou that arte a husbandman follow thy tillage, reape thy corn, and enioy it: if thou wart not defended by her diligence? Shouldest thou that arte a grasier kepe thy fat Bullockes and flockes of shepe, til they were fatte, if she were not thy shephearde? Shouldest thou that arte a marchant cary out, and fetch home, to thy exceding gain, thy merchaundise, onles she were thine Admirall? Could the Lord or gentleman enioy his rents, if she defended not the tenauntes? Coulde the bishops ruffle in their robes, kepe their great houses, and haue their thousands yerely, withal the rest of ther superfluitie, if she wer not their bulwarke, and took care for them, while thei care not for her? And to be short there is none that should enioy his owne: if her protection were not."—*Sig.* M. iv.

And as it was very important that one point, which had been, to be sure, rather strongly hinted at in this extract, should be fully understood, he reverts to it, and gives what he calls in his margin "Aduise to the Bishops" in very plain language. After stating that Philip of Macedon managed to settle his empire though he came to it disordered, and had "the Illyrians, the Pænyans, the Thessalonyans, the Boetians, and the Athetians, in his neck;" he adds:—

"In like maner Dauid entred into his kingdom, when the Philistins had made a meruelus slaughter in Israel, and killed king Saul and his sonnes in the field; and yet with in a while, he recouered the losses and had the better of al his enemies round about him: So I doubt not, but God shal send this Judith grace and power, to cut of Holophernes hed, and this Deborah to saue her people, and knock out Siceras brains, come he either out of fraunce, or out of scotland. But so much the soner, if al men like true subiectes, put

to their helping hande, knowinge that it is theyr quarrell aswell as hers.

"Come of you Bishoppes, away with your superfluities, yeld vp your thousands, be content with hundreds as they be in other reformed Churches, where be as greate learned men as you are. Let your portion be priestlike and not princelike. Let the Quene haue the rest of your temporalties, and other lands, to maintain these warres which you procured, and your mistresse left her, and with the rest to builde and founde scholes thorowoute the realm: that euerye parishe church may haue his preacher, euery City his superintendent to liue honestly and not pompously, whiche wil neuer be, onles your landes be dispersed and bestowed vpon many, which now feadeth and fatteth but one. Remember that Abimeleck, when Dauid in his banishment wold haue dined with him, kept such hospitaliti, that he had no bread in his house to geue him, but the Shewbred. Wher was all his superfluity to keepe your pretensed hospitalitie? for that is the cause that you alledge, why you must haue thousands as though you were commanded to kepe hospitalitie, rather with a thousande, then with a hundreth. I would our country man VVicliefes boke whych he wrote *De Ecclesia*, were in print, and there shoulde ye see that your wrinches and cauillations, be nothing worthe. It was my chaunce to happen of it in ones hand that brought it out of Bohemia.

"Lay to youre handes, you Noblemen, and rather sel a pece of your enheritance to help the Quene, then by a little backwardnes to ventre all, and to se a proud French man your heir, or a Scot the steward of your Landes. Learn you of thauncieut senators of Rome, and let your wiues, take example by theirs, to sette more by youre Prince, then your pomp, by your country, then by your curiositie and vnfitting superfluitie in apparel, dyet, and other vnnecessaries. These Romaines of whome I speake being stressed, and almoste brought to the last cast, by the long and daungerous warres of Hanibal, and the Frenche, did not only lyke louing fathers to their countrey, bring in their mony and goodes, without hinching or pinching, to reliefe the charges of their common welth, But also partly by honest perswasion, and partly by their good example, prouoked the noble matrones their wiues to bring in their ouches, ringes, chaines, bracelettes, and other iewelles, to be bestowed in the necessary defense of their countrey.

"Oh you Englishe Ladies, learne here rather to weare Romain hartes, then Spanish knaks, rather to helpe youre countrey, then hinder youre husbandes, to make your quene ryche for your defense then your husbandes poore for your garish gainesse. If euery one of you would but imploy your ringes and chaines, or the price of your superfluous ruffes, furres, fringes, and suche other trinkettes, vpon the necessary defence of your countrey, I thinke you shuld make the quene much richer, and habler to mete with your enemies, and your selfes much the honester, and reddier to withstande Satan, whiche this waye goeth about to sift you. Leaue of your pride, and leaue a good example, as the Romain ladies did, to your posterite, of loue to your countrey, loyaltie to your quene, and honestie towardes God and man.

"Be liberal you Gentlemen and thinke it not inough to serue the quene with your bodies, but helpe also with your goodes. Suffer not the Gentlemen of Fraunce to make you their slaues. Some of you knowe what natured men they be, beware that the rest feele not. It wilbe a shame and to great a vilanie for you, which in al ages haue bene hable to holde their nose to the grindstone, nowe either for sparing of your goodes, which is niggardie, or feare of your liues, which is cowardise, to be their pezantes, whose lordes your Auncettors were.

"Loke to this geare you Lawyers, whiche for a lyttle spending of your breath in chatering in the Chancery, and Common Place, become the Lordes of your cuntreis, and leaue your sonnes so great liuelodes as thei be noble mens matches. Some in sport cal you drudges and not iudges; but I thinke in god earnest that it is contrary, that you make you and your lordes and al other drudges. In this your so gret gain forget not what you owe to your prince, by whose protection you haue had leasure to study, and now time to plead. If your countrie be not kept in peax, your law wilbe litle worth, neither your copes nor coifes wil serue to any vse. I would you could al finde in your hartes to be as liberal toward your prince as some of you haue bene of late to the orders of Friers.

"Be no niggardes you Marchauntes of your gaines to releue the quene, for if you be: the vengeaunce of God wil come vppon your hurdes and bankes, the tratling Scot shal knocke out your chestes botoms, shal enioy your machaundize, meete out your veluets and silkes, carry awaye your clothes, brenne your fayre houses, and rule in your citie of London, which the Lord forbyd.

"In like maner you Farmers and Franklins, you yomen and rich Cobbes, abroad with your rusty ryals and your old Angels, which you hourd vp: for the ruste of them shalbe to your condempnacion, because you couetously kepe Gods creatures from their true vse, wherfore thei were made. They are called *curraunt*, and not *slepaunt*. Helpe your countrey with them, let the quene haue part of them, that you may peaceably enioy the rest. wherfore hourd you them vp, and for whome? *Thesaurizas nesciens cui congregas.* I am sure your meaning is thereby to leaue your sonnes and heires, landes and possessions, pastures wel stored, houses wel furnished, and honest soms of money to marry your daughters. But if thou best not liberal towardes the defence of thy country, who shal be thine heire? The pocky frenche man and the scoruy Scot: thyne olde gold shalbe caried away into Fraunce, thy sonne and thou shalt be made gally slaues. And where thou thinkest to marry thy daughter richelye: thou shalt see both hir and hir mother defiled before thy face miserably. Thy sonnes enheritaunce shalbe chaines in the gally, wherewith he shalbe fettered, & whippe vpon his bare skinne, if he row not to the death, and an horse lofe and water for his dayly dyet. Oh thynke vppon this, thynke vppon it, you hourders and hyders of Gods creatures. Lette not that mucke of the molde, those rustye Royalles be dearer to you, then your countrey, your Quene, your wyfe, and children, your owne bodies and lyues. VVhat a spyte were it, that you shoulde be the Treasurers of your mortall

foes, that you shoulde keepe for them to carry awaye, and hyde from your Quene to enryche the robber.

"And you Husbande men which haue Gods plenty, abundaunce of his blessinges. Sticke not to helpe your natural countrey so muche as you can. God is beneficiall vnto you, be not vnthankfull to his chefe minister. For like as the springes and brookes renne into the sea, so must all mens trauail tourne to the defence of his countrey."—*Sig.* O. iv.

So earnest is Aylmer's loyalty and patriotism, that he becomes absolutely pathetic in, what may be called, a sort of charity sermon for the new monarch; and, long as the extracts already given are, a part of his peroration must be added.

"Do you not heare how lamentably your natural mother your countrye of England, calleth vpon you for obediences saying, 'Oh, remember remember my dear children in what case you stande; your enemies be round about you, like vnsaciable rauenours to pluck me from you, to cast you out of my lap where I haue this .110. yeres lyke a faithful mother nourished you, a tyme sufficient for me I trow to know you, and you me. I haue bene and am glad of you, I delight and reioyce in you, aboue all other peoples. In declaration wherof I haue always spued out and cast from me Danes, Frenche, Norwegians, and Scottes. I could brooke none of them for the tender loue that I bare vnto you, of whome I haue my name. I neuer denyed to minister to you my singular commodities, which God hath lent me for you, as corne and cattell, lande and pasture, wull and cloth, lead and tynne, fleshe and fishe, gold and siluer, and all my other treasures: I haue poured them out among you, and enriched you aboue all your neighbours about you: which make them to enuie you, and couet me. Besides this God hathe brought forthe in me, the greatest and excellentest treasure that he hath, for your comfort and al the worldes. He would that out of my wombe should come that seruaunt of his your brother Ihon VVyclefe, who begate Husse, who begat Luther, who begat TRUTH. VVhat greter honor could you or I haue, then that it pleased Christ as it were in a second birth to be borne again of me among you? And will you now suffer me, or rather by your disobedience purchase me, to be a mother withoute my children, and to be made the nurse of a sorte of infideles, Idolaters, and Turkes? Can I abide to be without you, or can you be content to be without me? Oh God graunt that I neuer se the day that the basterdly brode of ambytious frenche men, eate and enioy the frutes whiche I prepare for you, my deare chyldren. Lette me rather satisfie my thirste with their effeminate bloud, then they should pluck from you my motherly breastes. Sticke to your mother, as she sticketh to you. Let me keepe in quiet and feede, as I haue done, your wyues, your children, and your kinsfolkes: Obey your mistres and mine which God hath made lady ouer vs, bothe by nature and lawe. You can not be my children, if you be not her subiectes: I wyll none of you, if you will none of hir. If you loue me you can not hate hir, as my hope is you doo not: if

you obey her, honour hir, and loue hir, be you assured that I wyll not fayle you at your neede, with any of my good frutes that you can requyre: I wyll fiill your bosomes and your mouthes, your wyues, and your children, with plentie." &c.—*Sig.* R.

That this appeal, eloquent and affecting as it was meant to be, did not lead the people to cast their living into the treasury or the privy purse, we know from history; but surely it must have "moved the stout heart of England's Queen." Strype, indeed, introduces Aylmer in the first page as "one of the excellent bishops made choice of by Queen Elizabeth to assist in the government of the church of England." But if so, it is obvious that she concealed her feelings, and delayed her choice for a long time. It seems that for four years all but eleven days—what an age to a keen suitor—she sat upon her throne, and slept in her bed, unmindful of her eulogist; or, to say the least, before he received any reward for his panegyric. Then he was made Archdeacon of Lincoln; and, as Strype says, "being Archdeacon, he was 'present at the famous synod, anno 1562, where the doctrine 'and discipline of the church, and the reformation of it 'from the abuses of popery, were carefully treated of and 'settled." It seems probable, that Aylmer received the preferment with a view to his being of service on that occasion; for the synod or convocation actually met in January, and he only became archdeacon on the 6th November previous. This is the more likely, because almost all that we know of him during those first four years of Elizabeth's reign is that, "he was but newly come home when he was appointed to hold a disputation in Westminster."—p. 11. What he did on that occasion does not appear, but in the convocation of 1562, "when the bandying happened in the lower house . . . . Aylmer was absent; whether," says Mr. Strype, "by chance, or on purpose, I know not."—p. 13. It does not much matter; but it looks as if his conduct had dissatisfied those whom he wished to please; and Strype was obliged to put in his margin "Sticks at Lincoln;" and, what was worse, to explain in the text, that he "stuck a long while" there. How he got away, after sticking some fifteen years, it is not our present business to inquire. He is produced here as the champion of the puritan party, and the author of what was, as far as I know, the only public apology of those who had written or coun-

tenanced the most ferocious libels on the late queen and her government.[3] The book and the man seem to have been treated with as much contempt and neglect as was convenient in the circumstances of the state. It was clear that the government could not do without the exiles, and it was sufficiently understood that they were not going to insist on any punctilios which might disqualify them for the service of her majesty, whom they were prepared to receive and acknowledge, not only as the lawful Queen of England, but as the Head of the Church and the Vicar of God.

All this is, indeed, made clearer to us by Aylmer's book, but it would probably have come about quite as soon, with less scandal to others, and less discredit to himself, if he had not interfered in the business.

ESSAY XI.

THE RIBALDS. No. I.

THE preceding Essay carried us forward into the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In order to return properly to the period and the subject with which we were engaged, we must now go back for a few moments to the reign of her father, for then began those seeds to spring which ripened into such a harvest of sin and misery in the days of Queen Mary.

We were considering the mode which the puritan party adopted in meeting the change of religion which then took place; and it has been shown that much plainness of speech was used by them in opposing the false doctrine and superstitious practice of the Church of Rome. They contended that the Pope was Antichrist—that his faith was false, his practice idolatrous, his mass devilish, and everything about him, or in any sort of communion with him, utterly abominable in the sight of that God whom he blasphemed by pretended worship.

[3] The "recantation" of Goodman, given by Strype, he supposes to have been made either "before the queen's privy council, or her bishops of the ecclesiastical commission." (Ann. I. i. 184.) I do not know that it was made public until he printed it from the Petyt MSS.

If they were right, the matter was surely very sad, as well as serious. One would think that the sight of such an abomination of desolation as they professed to see, must have filled all who had anything like the love of God in their hearts, or even the fear of God before their eyes, with grief and consternation—that if such men came to know that Chemosh and Ashtaroth had been set up in the Lord's House, they would have entered its courts in sackcloth and the spirit of heaviness, to displace them; and have passed them from hand to hand, without a word or a look exchanged, till the abominable things were clean out of the holy place, cast to the moles and the bats, or buried in outer darkness for ever.

But the matter was far otherwise. If there were men who acted under such feelings in grave, and quiet, and grateful pity—if there were others who mistook passion for zeal, and sincerely believed themselves authorised, nay, called upon, to do and say all that prophets or apostles had ever said or done, and even to assume the purifying scourge which One greater than the Temple made for Himself—if there were men who, with whatever mixture of human infirmity, wrote and spoke and acted as servants of God, pleading his cause and maintaining his truth before his face—if there were, as we may believe, some of all these classes, there were, at the same time, other partisans of the Reformation, very noisy and very numerous, of quite a different spirit, whom, to say the least, they did not keep at a proper distance, or repudiate with sufficiently marked detestation. I mean those who used a jeering, scoffing humour, to turn the ministers and the services of religion into ridicule—men who employed themselves in raising a laugh against popery, at whatever expense, and in providing for the eyes and ears of even the rude multitude who could not read, gross and profane pictures, jests, songs, interludes—all, in short, that could nurse the self-conceit of folly, and agitate ignorance into rebellion against its spiritual pastors and teachers.

Of course no historian of the Reformation could entirely pass over this very obvious and startling feature; but it seems to have been noticed and inquired into less than it should have been; and without pretending, on an occasion like this, to remedy the defect, I think it may be of some service to the cause of truth to point it out, and to offer some

facts and observations which may tend to show its importance. But to do this ever so imperfectly and superficially, we must, as I have said, turn back to the time of Henry the Eighth.

It would be an affront to the reader to suppose him less than quite familiar with everything in Robertson's Charles V.; and, therefore, I assume his recollecting that, in the month of May, 1527, the city of Rome was assaulted and taken by the imperial army under the command of the Duke of Bourbon. The pope was a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo, his troops were dispersed, and "it is impos-'sible to describe or even to imagine the misery and horror 'of that scene which followed. Whatever a city taken by 'storm can dread from military rage unrestrained by disci-'pline; whatever excesses the ferocity of the Germans, the 'avarice of the Spaniards, or the licentiousness of the 'Italians could commit, these the wretched inhabitants 'were obliged to suffer. Churches, palaces, and the houses 'of private persons were plundered without distinction. 'No age, or character, or sex was exempt from injury. 'Cardinals, nobles, priests, matrons, virgins, were all the 'prey of soldiers, and at the mercy of men deaf to the voice 'of humanity. Nor did these outrages cease, as is usual in 'towns carried by assault, when the first fury of the storm 'was over; the imperialists kept possession of Rome several 'months; and during all that time, the insolence and 'brutality of the soldiers scarce abated."[1]

If the historian had been writing with a view to the religious and ecclesiastical aspect and bearing of the matter, he might perhaps have added, that among the victors there were some at least who had in them an element distinct from "the ferocity of the Germans, the avarice of the Spaniards, or the licentiousness of the Italians," which manifested itself, not merely in the desecration of sacred places, but in ridicule of the ministers and services of religion; in mock processions, and a mock election of Luther for pope.

I refer, however, to this historical event principally in order to observe that there is said to have been among the followers of the Duke of Bourbon (whether he was among

[1] Robertson's Charles V., vol. ii. p. 286.

the mock cardinals who rode in procession on asses, I do not know) an Englishman, of low birth, vicious habits, and infidel principles, who afterwards became of terrific importance to the Church of England. His friends tell us that, in after life he described himself as having formerly been a "ruffian;" and it is likely that at the time when this happened whether he was there or not, he had no preference, and no respect, for either popery or protestantism, and acted under no principle but that which taught him to do the best he could for himself. If he was at the sacking of Rome, it seems more likely that he was there in the service of Wolsey than as "a trooper of the Duke of Bourbon." Certainly he was soon afterwards a servant of the cardinal, and continued to serve him until his disgrace in October, 1529.

The fall of Wolsey was, of course, felt by his household; but there was a considerable difference between the circumstances of the two bodies of which that great multitude of servants and retainers consisted. The ecclesiastics were all more or less provided for. The cardinal had so enriched some of his chaplains that they might dispend a thousand pounds by the year,—a princely income in those days,—and the poorest of them had an ample provision in preferment yielding an annual sum of at least three hundred marks; and these preferments, whether more or less, were their own, and would remain to them. On the other hand, the laymen had no prospect but that of being turned adrift, with only such provision as they might have had the unnatural prudence to make in a house where they were not likely to learn lessons of thrift and economy, and where, as it regarded many of them, the honour of the service, and the probability of its leading to promotion, formed the only remuneration.

It is likely that no man saw this more clearly, or felt it more keenly, than Thomas Cromwell—the rather, we may imagine, because there seems to have been a very current and well-credited report—one, therefore, not likely to have been entirely without foundation—that when his master was disgraced he would be hanged. The fact cannot, I imagine, be doubted; though, as far as I know, it is not anywhere clearly explained, or, indeed, explained at all, except by the supposition that he had rendered himself

unpopular, both to the people and the king, by some "ruffian"-like conduct in the business of the monasteries, which the cardinal suppressed for the benefit of his colleges, in the management of which Cromwell had been a chief instrument. It is not improbable that his zealous service may have carried him so far beyond the letter of the law in this matter, as to make the power and protection of his great master very necessary for his personal safety. But, however this may be, by the time that the Cardinal had been driven to his house at Esher, and "was of necessity 'compelled to borrow of the Bishop of Carlisle and of Sir 'Thomas Arundell, both dishes to eat his meat in, and 'plate to drink in, and also linen clothes to occupy," Thomas Cromwell began to think that it was time to look about him; and accordingly, on Nov. 1, 1529, at Esher aforesaid, he was found by George Cavendish, in what he, who knew the man well, considered very peculiar circumstances—but it were a pity not to let that quaint and right entirely beloved old gentleman-usher tell the story in his own inimitable manner.

"It chanced me upon All-hallowne day to come into the great chamber at Asher, in the morning, to give mine attendance, where I found Mr. Cromwell leaning in the great windowe with a Primer in his hand, saying our Lady mattens; which had bine a strange sight in him afore.[2] Well, what will you have more? He prayed no more earnestly, than he distilled teares as fast from his eyes. Whom I saluted, and bad good morrowe. And with that I perceived his

[2] I give this extract from Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, as it stands in the third edition of Dr. Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, vol. i. p. 568. Singer, in his edition of Cavendish, (I have only that of 1827 at hand,) prints this passage "which had been *since* a very strange sight." In a note he says, "Dr. Wordsworth's edition and the later manuscripts read: 'which had been a strange sight in him *afore;*' but this can hardly be right." This mode of writing looks as if Mr. Singer had either conjecturally amended his text, or been doubtful of it. Dr. Wordsworth in his third edition (*ut supra*), quotes these words of Mr. Singer, and adds: "The reader's *wishes* unquestionably will go along with Mr. S. in the 'opinion here expressed. But I see no sufficient reasons for entertaining 'it; or for any change in the text. I fear Cromwell, in his earlier years, 'may have been a man to have given occasion for such a remark being 'made as that objected to; especially by a writer of George Cavendish's 'principles," &c. The reader may find more discussion in the places cited. For my own part, the variety of readings seems to be of little importance, though I have thought it right to mention that it exists. That Cromwell had before that time avowed infidel principles is beyond a doubt.

moist chekes, the which he wiped with his napkine. To whom I saide, 'Why Mr. Cromewell, what meaneth this dole? Is my Lord in any danger, that ye doe lament for him? or is it for any other losse, that ye have sustained by misfortune?'

"'Nay,' quoth he, 'it is for my unhappy adventure. For I am like to lose all that I have laboured for, all the daies of my life, for doing of my master true and diligent service.' 'Why Sir,' quoth I, 'I trust that you be too wise, to do anything by my Lord's commandment, otherwise than ye might doe, whereof you ought to be in doubt or daunger for losse of your goods.' 'Well, well,' quoth he, 'I cannot tell; but this I see before mine eyes, that everything is as it is taken; and this I knowe well, that I am disdained with all for my masters sake; and yet I am sure there is no cause, why they should doe so. An evill name once gotten will not lightly be put away. I never had promotion by my Lord to the increase of my living. But this much I will say to you, that I will this afternoone, when my Lord hath dined, ride to London, and so the courte, where I will either make or marre, or ever I come again. I will put myself in prease, to see what they be able to lay to my charge.' 'Mary,' quoth I, 'then in so doing you shall doe wisely, beseeching God to send you good lucke, as I would myselfe.' And with that I was called into the closet, to see and prepare all things ready for my Lord, whoe intended to say masse there that day himselfe; and so I did."

I have no wish to do injustice to Cromwell, or to represent him as acting on lower or worse motives than those by which some have supposed him to be influenced in his general conduct, and particularly in his support of the Reformation; but I must say that I cannot give him credit for a sincere desire to help his patron, or even acquit him of deliberate malice against that order to which the cardinal belonged, and a settled purpose to degrade and ruin it. This is not the place to inquire whether he went to London to solicit for his patron or himself, or whether he thought he might do both at once; but it is most important to notice the account which Cavendish gives of the circumstances immediately preceding his departure from Esher. It seems to me impossible that without some such design as I have suggested, he could at such a time have broached such a subject, pressed it in such a manner, and got up such a scene as he did. Could he have done it without a premeditated danger of imparting to others the feelings of discontent, envy, and jealousy, which he had just avowed, and of sowing discord among those whom he was leaving? Immediately after the passage already quoted, Cavendish proceeds:—

"Then my Lord came thither with his chaplaine, one doctor Marshall, and first said mattens, and heard two masses in the time of his mattens saying. And that sayd, he prepared himself to masse; and so saide masse himself. And when he had finished all his service, incontinent after he was returned into his chamber, he called for his dinner, who was served into his privy chamber, and there dined among diverse his doctors, among whome this master Cromwell dined; and sitting at dinner, it came to passe [that he fell] in communication of his gentlemen and servauntes, whose true and faithful service my lord much commended. Whereupon Mr. Cromwell toke an occasion to tell my Lord, that he ought in conscience to consider the true and good service that they did him in this his necessity, the which doe never forsake him in weale ne in woe, and saide,

"'Sir, it should be well done for your Grace to call them before you, bothe gentlemen which be worthy personages, and also your yeomen, and let them understande, that ye righte well consider their paines and truthe with their faithful service; and to give them your commendation, with good words, the which shall be to them great courage to sustaine your misery with paines and patience, and to spend their life and substance in your service.'

"'Alas, Thomas,' quoth my lord, 'ye knowe I have nothing to give them, and wordes without deeds be not often well taken. For if I had but as I late had, I would departe with them so frankely, as they should be well contente: but nothing, hath no savor; and I am bothe ashamed, and also sorry that I am not able to requite their faithful service. And although I doe rejoice as I may, to consider the fidelity I see in a number of my servants, who will not forsake me in my miserable tate, but be as diligent and as serviceable about me as they were in my great triumphe and glory, yet I doe lament againe, as vehemently, the want of substance, to distribute among them.'

"'Why, Sir,' quoth master Cromewell, 'have ye not here a number of chapleines, to whom ye have departed liberally with spirituall promotions, in so much as some may dispend, by your Grace's preferment, at housande pounds by yeare, and some five hundred marks, and some more and some lesse; you have not a chapleine within all your house, or belonging to you, but he may spend well at the least (by your procurement and promotion) three hundred markes yearely, who have had all the profit and gaines at your handes, and other your servauntes nothing: and yet have your *poore servauntes* taken much more paines in one day, than all your *idle chapleines* have done in a yeare. Therefore if they will not frankely and freely consider your liberality, and departe with you of the same goods gotten in your service, now in your great indigence and necessity, it is a pitty that they live; and all the world will have them in indignation and hatred, for their ingratitude to their master.'

"'I think no lesse Thomas,' quoth my lord, 'wherefore, I pray you, cause all my servants to assemble without, in my great chamber, after dinner, and see them stand in order, and I will declare my mind unto them.'

"After that the borde's end was taken up, master Cromewell

came to me, and saide 'Heard you not,' quoth he, 'what my Lorde saide?' 'Yes Sir, that I did,' quoth I. 'Well then,' quoth he, 'call all the gentlemen and yeomen up into the great chamber;' and even so I did, commanding all the gentlemen to stand on the right side of the chamber, and all the yeomen on the other side. And at the laste my lord came out in his rochet upon a violet gowne, like a bishop, who went streight to the upper ende of the saide chamber, where was the great windowe. Standing there a while, his chapleins about him, beholding this goodly number of his servaunts, he could not speake unto them, untill the teares ran downe his chekes: which fewe teares perceived by his servants, caused the fountaines of water to gusshe out of their faithfull eyes, in such sorte as it would cause a cruell harte to lament. At the last, after he had turned his face to the windowe, and dried his moisted chekes, he spake to them in this sorte in effect."

Of the Cardinal's speech, which his good gentleman usher gives at some length, it is sufficient for our purpose to notice the few sentences at the end of it, which elicited the reply of Cromwell:—

"'If the King doe not shortly restore me, then will I write for you, either to the King, or to any noble man within this realme, to retaine your service; for I doubt not but the Kinge or any noble man within this realme, will credite my letter in your commendation. Therefore, in the meantime, I would advise you to repaire home to your wives, such as have wives; and some of you that have no wives, to take a time to visit your parents in the country. There is none of you all, but would once in a yeare, require licence to see and visit your wife, and other of your friends: take this time therefore in that respect, and in your retourne I will not refuse you, to beg with you. I consider that your service in my house hath been such, that ye be not apt to serve any man under the degree of a king; therefore I would advise you to serve no man but the King, who I am sure will not refuse you. Therefore I shall desire you to take your pleasure for a month, and then ye may come againe, and by that time, I trust the King will extend his mercy upon me.'

"'Sir,' quoth master Cromewell, 'there be diverse of these your yeomen, that would be glad to see their friends, but they lacke money: therefore here be diverse of your chapleines that have received at your hands great benefices and livings; let them show themselves unto you as they be bound to doe. I think their honesty and charity is such that they will not see you lacke anything that may doe you good or pleasure. And for my parte, although I have not received of your graces gifte one penny towards the increase of my livinge, yet will I give you this towards the dispatch of your servantes,' and therewith delivered unto my lord five pounds in gold. 'And now let us see what your chapleines will doe. I think they will departe with you, much more liberally than I, who be more able to give you a pound than I a penny.' 'Goe to my masters,' quoth he to the chapleines; insomuch as they gave to my lord liberally, some ten pounds, some twenty nobles, some five pounds,

and so some more and some lesse, as their powers would extend, at that time;" &c.

Certainly different persons view the same thing in very different lights, and receive very opposite impressions from the same facts. Dr. Fiddes, with reference to the words of Cavendish just quoted, says, "Cromwell having observed, 'that several of the servants, who were ready to obey the 'commands of their master, wanted money to this end, did 'himself propose a contribution, and recommended it *after* '*a very handsome insinuating manner*, especially by an act 'of his own liberality. His example was followed by the 'chaplains, and by that means a competent sum was raised 'for the benefit and present supply of the servants."[3] But, whatever judgment the reader may form of Cromwell's motive or action in this case, it is certain that when "my 'lord returned into his chamber lamenting the departure 'from his servants, making his mone to master Cromewell, 'who comforted him the best he could," he, the said master Cromwell, "desired my lord to give him leave to goe to 'London, whereas he would either *make or marre* (the 'which was alwaies his common terme.)" It was clearly not from George Cavendish that Shakespeare got the idea that the Cardinal told Cromwell to "seek the King."

> "Good Cromwell,
> Neglect him not; make use now, and provide
> For thine own future safety."

"Good Cromwell" stood in need of no such advice; and had it been given he seems as if he would not have been likely to answer:—

> "O my Lord,
> Must I then leave you? Must I needs forego
> So good, so noble, and so true a master?
> Bear witness, all that have not hearts of iron,
> With what a sorrow Cromwell leaves his Lord.
> The King shall have my service; but my prayers
> For ever and for ever shall be yours."[4]

It was clearly his own scheme; and having obtained permission of his Lord, away he rode that same afternoon, with Rafe Sadler, who was "then his clerk," at his heels, and the resolution to "make or marre" in his heart; and

[3] Life of Wolsey, p. 476.
[4] Henry VIII., act iii. scene vi.

what he made and what he marred, has long been matter of history.

But why all this—why anything—about Thomas Lord Cromwell? Simply because he was the great patron of ribaldry, and the protector of the ribalds, of the low jester, the filthy ballad-monger, the alehouse singers, and "hypocritical mockers in feasts," in short, of all the blasphemous mocking and scoffing which disgraced the protestant party at the time of the Reformation. It is of great consequence in our view of the times, to consider that the vile publications, of which too many remain, while most have rotted, and the profane pranks which were performed, were not the outbreaks of low, ignorant, partisans, a rabble of hungry dogs such as is sure to run after a party in spite even of sticks and stones bestowed by those whom they follow and disgrace. It was the result of design and policy, earnestly and elaborately pursued by the man possessing, for all such purposes, the highest place and power in the land. We know this, not because his enemies have charged him with conniving at, or even countenancing, these detestable proceedings; it is a hearty partisan and admirer, one likely to be well informed too on such a point, and glorying in it, who tells us that,

"This valiant soldier and captain of Christ, the aforesaid lord Cromwell, as he was most studious of himself in a flagrant zeal to set forward the truth of the gospel, seeking all means and ways to beat down false religion and to advance the true, so he always retained unto him and had about him such as could be found helpers and furtherers of the same; in the number of whom were sundry and divers fresh and quick wits, pertaining to his family; by whose industry and ingenious labours, divers excellent ballads and books were contrived and set abroad, concerning the suppression of the pope and all popish idolatry. Amongst which, omitting a great sort that we might here bring in, yet this small treatise here following called, 'The Fantassie of Idolatrie,' we thought not to pass over, containing in it, as in a brief sum, the great mass of idolatrous pilgrimages; for the posterity hereafter to understand, what then was used in England."—*Fox's Mart.*, Vol. V. p. 403, *replaced from the first edition.*

As Fox gives us his testimony that he was selecting from "a great sort" of this stuff, and not picking out an eminent and singular specimen of profane jesting, it is, perhaps, quite as well that he has preserved only one of the vile ballads. It is of course quite sufficient to give us a correct general

idea of the article, and it is not a little remarkable that we should at this day be able to lay our finger upon it, and say, "*this* is one of Cromwell's ballads." It answers a thousand cavils which might otherwise be raised as to whether he would have approved of this or that; for it would be hard, I think, to conceive of anything too profane for the patronage of one to whom we are indebted for the "Fantasie of Idolatrie." There would be no use in quoting the more inoffensive parts of the ballad, while those which really bear on our argument are too bad for repetition; and it is unnecessary to enter into any discussion of them, unless some respectable person should come forward to defend them; which is, perhaps, hardly to be expected. Fox had, I believe, the decency, or the policy, to omit the ballad, and this fact respecting the Lord Cromwell, in every edition after his first; but both have been replaced, in the recent edition of Mr. Cattley, published by Messrs. Seeley. The ballad may, for anything I know, be greatly relished by the admirers of Fox. A note at the end of it tells us that it was "made and compiled by Gray." Who he might be, I know not, except as it is here implied, that he was one of the "quick wits" pertaining to Cromwell's family, and "retained unto him" for the purpose of making excellent ballads and books. That with such a manufactory, and under such high patronage, all sorts of ribaldry should flourish and abound, was natural enough.

Bishop Burnet, speaking of Bonner's Injunctions to his Clergy in the year 1542, one of which was, "no plays or interludes to be acted in churches," says:—

"The Injunctions take notice of another thing, which the sincerity of an Historian obliges me to give an account of, *though* it was indeed the greatest blemish of that time."

Surely a more quaint acknowledgment of party views was never made. A man need not set up to be the historian of any particular time; but if he does, the "greatest blemish of that time" can hardly be passed over with any pretension to common honesty; but he proceeds:—

"These were the Stage-plays and Interludes which were then *generally* acted, and *often in churches*. They were representations of the corruptions of the monks, and some other feats of the popish clergy. The Poems were ill-contrived, and worse expressed: if there lies not some hidden wit in these ballads (for verses they were not) which at this distance is lost. But from the representing the

immoralities and disorders of the clergy, *they proceeded to act the pageantry of their worship. This took with the people much,* who being provoked by the miscarriages and cruelties of some of the clergy, were not ill-pleased to see *them* and their *religion* exposed to public scorn. The clergy complained much of this; and said it was an introduction to Atheism, and all sort of Irreligion. For if once they began to mock sacred things, no stop could be put to that petulant humour. The grave and learned sort of Reformers *disliked and condemned* these courses, as not suitable to the genius of true religion; but the political men of that party *made great use of them, encouraging them all they could;* for they said, Contempt being the most operative and lasting affection of the mind, nothing would more effectually drive out many of those abuses, which yet remained, than to expose them to the contempt and scorn of the people." [5]

I believe this statement to be false, and I find great difficulty in understanding how the historian could possibly believe it to be true. If he did, and did so on evidence, it is a pity that he should have given no authority for a fact so important as it respects those persons whose character and actions he was so anxious to vindicate. There is, however, a clear issue. We are not here disputing about any matter of feeling or opinion. Burnet admits that ribaldry and mocking, filthiness, and foolish talking, and jesting such as was not convenient, were made great use of, and encouraged in every possible way by the "*political* men of that party," but he states that these courses were "disliked and condemned" by the "grave and learned sort of reformers." Here is a plain matter of fact. Who were the grave and learned reformers who opposed these courses? What did they do to put a stop to them? Where is their dislike and condemnation recorded? There may be protests and con-

[5] History of the Reformation, Book III., vol. i. p. 303. If the reader looks at the Injunction itself as it stands in Burnet's Collection of Records, (No. 26, p. 238 of the same volume,) he will find a few words in it which will give him a little more light as to the state of things at that time—"And if there be any of your parishioners, or any other Person or 'Persons, that will *obstinately or violently inforce* any such Plays, Inter-'ludes, or Games to be declared, set forth or played in your churches, or 'chappels," &c.—then they were to report such persons to the bishop. Will the reader give one minute's quiet consideration to these words, and try to imagine the state of things which they indicate? Surely they speak volumes. Yet it is necessary to prefer a specific request for this consideration, because there is, to readers in the present day, something so very unimaginable in the idea of a party of puritans coming *vi et armis* to act a play in a church, that it may require more trouble than most will take to realize it.

demnations in the writings of some of the reformers; but I know not of them. God forbid that I should suppress them if I did[6]. It has seemed to me that too many whom Burnet

[6] The only thing bearing the least resemblance to an exception which occurs to me, is Strype's statement, (in connexion with the treatment of certain anabaptists who "spake contemptibly of the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" in the year 1547,) that "though Ridley were not for 'that gross, corporeal popish presence in the Sacrament, yet he approved 'of treating that holy mystery with all devotion and honour; *because* '[what an odd reason] there were many in those times, who, that they 'might run the farther from Popery, gave it little or no respect at all. 'Wherefore he in a sermon at Paul's Cross, preached earnestly for giving 'great reverence to the Sacrament: rebuking the unreverend behaviour 'of many towards it: for there had been fixed upon the cathedral church 'doors, and other places, *railing bills against the Sacrament*, terming it, '*Jack in a box, the Sacrament of the halter, Round Robin*, and such like 'unseemly terms. Though they meant not these contemptible expres-'sions, *I suppose*, against the holy Supper of our Lord, but only against 'the papal mass."—*Mem.* II. i. 108. One is really almost tempted to envy good Mr. Strype his powers of supposition—but this, I repeat, is the only instance that I recollect of a protestant voice raised in condemnation of even the rankest and most hideous works of the ribald spirit which was abroad in those days.

[In consequence of this statement a correspondent, who did not favour me with his name, pointed out to me a passage in Coverdale's preface to his translation of Calvin's treatise on the Sacrament, lately published by the Parker Society, in which, after speaking rather strongly of the ceremonies observed by the Romanists in the celebration of the Eucharist, Coverdale says, "I will speak no more as concerning their fond inven-'tions about the ministration of this most sacred sacrament, lest I should 'thereby be an offence or stumbling-block to the weak brothers, whose 'consciences are not yet fully satisfied as concerning the true belief of this 'holy mystery; I mean, lest I should give them occasion to do, as certain 'fond talkers have of late days done, and at this present day do invent 'and apply to this most holy sacrament names of despite and reproach, as 'to call it 'Jack-in-the-box' and 'Round Robin,' and such other not only 'fond, but also blasphemous names, not only void of all edification, (which 'ought to be the end of all our doings and sayings,) but very slanderous 'also. For though the thing being so turned from the right use, as it is, 'be abominable, so that it is lawful for us to speak unreverently of it in 'the abuse; yet it is not meet for them that profess charity, nothing to 'refrain for conscience' sake: the conscience, I say, of the weak brothers, 'not yet strong in the truth; and so much the more, for that many godly-'minded persons, which by the persuasions of certain discreet and modest 'brothers have been made, of Romish idolaters and diligent students of 'duncical dregs, disciples of great hope in the sincere and true evangelic 'doctrine, have by the hearing of these names of reproach and despite 'taken occasion to think, that the knowledge which these men did pro-'fess, which would be so outrageous as to mock and jest at the remem-'brance of our redemption, could not proceed of the Spirit of God; and

would have placed among "the grave and learned sort of reformers," were so far from expressing dislike and condemnation, as that, if they did not give direct encouragement and praise, they could stand by and laugh in their sleeves, while others were doing what it might not have beseemed the "grave and learned sort" to do themselves. To say the truth, I cannot but think that any one who observes how Burnet himself, when not particularly engaged in performing the sincere historian, relates the profane and irreverent pranks which some of "the party" indulged, will doubt whether, if he had lived at the time, he would have been very forward or very fierce in trying to stop or to punish "these courses." For instance, he relates an incident which occurred shortly after the accession of Queen Mary, in a tone which reminds me very much of the "mixture of glee and compunction" with which Edie Ochiltree dwelt on the exploits of his youth. The passage, not only for this, but for the historical fact itself, is much to our purpose, and quite worth quoting:—

"There were many *ludicrous* things everywhere done in derision of the old forms and of the Images: many Poems were printed, with other ridiculous representations of the Latin service, and the pageantry of their worship. But none occasioned more *laughter*, than what fell out at Pauls the Easter before; the custom being to lay the Sacrament into the Sepulchre at Even-song on Good Friday, and to take it out by break of day on Easter morning: At the time of the taking of it out, the Quire sung these words, 'Surrexit, non est hic, He is risen, he is not here;' But then the priest looking for the host,

'have through this persuasion returned to their old leaven again; think-
'ing them to be the true teachers of God's doctrine, which offend in the
'contrary; making it so divine a thing, that it should be of no less im-
'portance than the whole Trinity, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost:
'for so they affirm, saying, that forasmuch as it is the body of Christ, and
'that Christ is in all places at once with his Father, and his Father with
'him and the Holy Ghost, it must needs follow, that in it is the whole
'Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. For these are not
'nor cannot be separated."—p. 426. I may add that my unknown correspondent mentioned it as the only instance which he had observed; and that nothing of the kind has since come under my observation. At the same time, I need hardly say that it would require many more, and much stronger and weightier to counterbalance the single, pregnant voluminous sentence of Strype,—"Wherefore he consulting with the Lord Crumwel his CONSTANT ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT in SUCH matters; and by his and other his friends, importuning the King, a commission was issued," &c.—*Cran.* I. 72. A little farther on Strype tells us that the Archbishop "required direction from him [Crumwel] in everything."—*Ibid.* p. 79.

found it was not there indeed, for one had stolen it out; which put them all in no small disorder, but another was presently brought in its stead. Upon this a *ballad* followed, That their God was stolen and lost, but a new one was made in his room. This Raillery was so salt, that it provoked the clergy much. They offered large rewards to discover him that had stolen the host, or had made the ballad, but could not come to the knowledge of it."—Vol. ii. p. 270.

I do not know where Burnet got this story, because, as in too many other cases, he gives no authority. Fox relates the same thing as happening on the same day at St. Pancras in Cheap, and perhaps it is the same story[7]; and in the next paragraph Fox tells us a story that should not be separated from the other, and which Bishop Burnet might have considered equally "ludicrous:"—

"The 8th of April there was a cat hanged upon a gallows at the Cross in Cheap, apparelled like a priest ready to say mass, with a shaven crown. Her two fore-feet were tied over her head, with a round paper like a wafer-cake put between them: whereon arose great evil-will against the City of London; for the Queen and the Bishops were very angry withal. And therefore the same afternoon there was a proclamation, that whosoever could bring forth the party that did hang up the cat, should have twenty nobles, which reward was afterwards increased to twenty marks; but none could or would earn it."—Vol. vi. p. 548.

It is needless to say that the story is told by Fox without any mark of dislike or condemnation, for he has given ample proof that he enjoyed such things amazingly. Indeed it seems probable that his troubles first began, while he was yet at college, from the indulgence of that jeering, mocking spirit which so strongly characterizes his martyrology. Take a specimen that occurs only ten pages after the story of the cat, and which he introduces by saying, "But one thing, by 'the way, I cannot let pass, touching the young flourishing 'rood newly set up against this present time to welcome 'King Philip into Paul's Church;" and having described the ceremony of its being set up, he proceeds:—

"Not long after this, a merry fellow came into Pauls, and spied the rood with Mary and John new set up; whereto (among a great sort of people) he made a low courtesy, and said: Sir, your mastership is welcome to town. I had thought to have talked further with your mastership, but that ye be here clothed in the Queens colours.

[7] If Burnet took the story from Fox one would like to know what led him to omit one point which is stated by the martyrologist—namely, that "the *crucifix*" as well as "the pix" was stolen.

I hope ye be but a summer's bird in that ye be dressed in white and green, &c."[8]

Another brief specimen may be found in a story of a "mayor of Lancaster, who was a very meet man for such a purpose, and an old favourer of the gospel," who had to decide a dispute between the parishioners of Cockram and a workman whom they had employed to make a rood for their church. They refused to pay him because, as they averred, he had made an ill-favoured figure, gaping and grinning in such a manner that their children were afraid to look at it. The "old favourer of the gospel," who seems to have been much amused by such a representation of his Saviour being set up in the church, recommended them to go and take another look at it, adding, "'and if it will not serve for a 'god, make no more ado, but clap a pair of horns on his 'head, and so he will make an excellent devil.' This the 'parishioners took well in worth; the poor man had his 'money; and divers laughed well thereat—but so did not 'the Babylonish priests."[9] Strange that the priests did not join in the fun; and stranger still that those blind papists did not seize on the skirts of the "old favourer of the gospel," and say, "We will go with you, for we see that God is with you."

But the subject, which I have scarcely opened in this paper, requires a more full and regular inquiry and consideration; and some hints and extracts which may assist in this, I hope to furnish.

ESSAY XII.

THE RIBALDS. No. II.

THOSE who have any acquaintance at all with the history of the Reformation, even if they have not made themselves particularly acquainted with the class of persons and works to which I am now endeavouring to direct attention, will

[8] Ed. 1596, p. 1338. I quote this old edition rather than that of Mr. Cattley, because he omits the "&c." at the end of the extract, which seems to be doing injustice to the "merry fellow," not to say to the reporter.

[9] V. I. 564.

not so far misunderstand me as to suppose that I am speaking with reference to the controversies, and contentions, which naturally arose at that period; and which, even among the learned, were too often carried on in language which would not now be used, and in a temper which could never be lawful and right. Such is our nature, that when even good men are excited, and injured, and provoked, we must expect some wrath, and clamour, and evil speaking; and we must not take it as a proof either that these were not good men, or that wrath, and clamour, and evil speaking, by good men in a good cause, are really good things, which we ought to admire in our forefathers, while, for our own part, we claim the higher grace and praise of what is called "a sweet spirit."

It will, I hope, be equally obvious that I do not refer to the outbreaks of fanaticism which naturally accompanied such a period of excitement; and which, I suppose, none of the modern admirers of Fox would think of defending, though the actors in them are still permitted to swell his calendar of Martyrs. Take, for instance, "The history, no 'less lamentable than notable, of William Gardiner, an 'Englishman, suffering most constantly in Portugal, for the 'testimony of God's truth." It would be worth while to extract the graphic account which Fox has preserved, were it only that it might help us to judge of the light in which the English reformers, and their proceedings, were likely to be viewed in foreign countries. Imagine such a scene as Fox here describes occurring in Lisbon, where William Gardiner, the Englishman, was living as the agent of a mercantile house:—

"It happened that there should be a solemn marriage celebrated the first of September in the year above said, betwixt two princes; that is to say, the son of the king of Portugal, and the Spanish king's daughter. The marriage day being come, there was great resort of the nobility and estates. There lacked no bishops with mitres, nor cardinals with hats, to set out this royal wedding. To be short, they went forward to the wedding with great pomp, where a great concourse of people resorted, some of good will, some for service sake, and some (as the matter is) to gaze and look. Great preparation of all parties was there throughout the whole city, as in such cases is accustomed, and all places were filled with mirth and gladness. In this great assembly of the whole kingdom, William Gardiner, albeit he did not greatly esteem such kind of spectacles, yet being allured through the fame and report thereof, was there

also; coming thither early in the morning, to the intent he might have the more opportunity, and better place, to behold and see.

"The hour being come, they flocked into the church with great solemnity and pomp; the king first, and then every estate in order; the greater persons, the more ceremonies were about them. After all things were set in order, they went forward to the celebrating of their mass; for that alone serveth for all purposes. The cardinal did execute, with much singing and organ-playing. The people stood with great devotion and silence, praying, looking, kneeling, and knocking; their minds being fully bent and set, as it is the manner, upon the external sacrament. How grievously these things did prick and move this young man's mind, it cannot be expressed —partly to behold the miserable absurdity of those things, and partly to see the folly of the common people; and not only of the common people, but, especially, to see the king himself, and his council, with so many sage and wise men as they seemed, to be seduced with like idolatry as the common people were; insomuch that it lacked very little, but that he would, even that present day, have done some notable thing in the king's sight and presence, but that the great press and throng that was about him, letted that he could not come unto the altar. What need many words? When the ceremonies were ended, he cometh home very sad and heavy in his mind, insomuch that all his fellows marvelled greatly at him; who, albeit upon divers conjectures they conceived the cause of his sadness, notwithstanding they did not fully understand that those matters did so much trouble his godly mind; neither yet did he declare it unto any man: but, seeking solitariness and secret places, falling down prostrate before God, with manifold tears he bewailed the neglecting of his duty, deliberating with himself how me might revoke that people from their impiety and superstition.

"In this deliberation and advice his mind being fully settled, and thinking that the matter ought not to be any longer deferred, he renounced the world, making up all his accounts so exactly (as well of that which was due unto him, as that which he owed unto others) that no man could justly ask so much as one farthing. Which thing done, he continued night and day in prayer, calling upon God, and in continual meditation of the Scriptures, that scarcely he would take any meat by day, or sleep by night, or at the most above one hour or two of rest in the night; as Pendigrace, his fellow companion both at bed and board, being yet alive, can testify.

"The Sunday came again to be celebrated either with like pomp and solemnity, or not much less, whereat the said William was present early in the morning, very cleanly apparelled, even of purpose, that he might stand near the altar without repulse. Within a while after, cometh the king with all his nobles. Then Gardiner setteth himself as near the altar as he might, having a Testament in his hand, which he diligently read upon, and prayed, until the time was come, that he had appointed to work his feat. The mass began, which was then solemnized by a cardinal. Yet he sat still. He which said mass proceeded: he consecrated, sacrificed, lifted up on high, showed his god unto the people. All the people gave great reverence, and as yet he stirred nothing. At last, they came unto

that place of the mass, where they use to take the ceremonial host, and toss it too and fro round about the chalice, making certain circles and semicircles. Then the said William Gardiner, being not able to suffer any longer, ran speedily unto the cardinal; and (which is incredible to be spoken) even in the presence of the king and all his nobles and citizens, with the one hand he snatched away the cake from the priest, and trod it under his feet, and with the other hand overthrew the chalice. This matter at first made them all abashed, but, by and by, there arose a great tumult, and the people began to cry out. The nobles and the common people ran together, amongst whom one, drawing out his dagger, gave him a great wound in his shoulder; and, as he was about to strike him again to have slain him, the king twice commanded to have him saved. So, by that means, they abstained from murder."—*Fox* vol. vi. p. 277.

It is not wonderful that the blind papists of Portugal misunderstood this aggressive piety, and supposed the bold foreigner to have some political views, as well as some abettors in the matter, whom it was important to discover. This they attempted by the cruel practices too commonly used in those days; but learning nothing by these means, they put him to death, while he constantly declared, even in the flames, that "he had done nothing whereof he did repent him."

Again, "the story of Bertrand," who was martyred at Dornick (or Tournay) in 1552, is similar, and as the introduction truly states it is "lamentable." It is one of a large class, which, looking merely to the acts, and the actors, might well be suffered to pass into oblivion. It is, to be sure, not without use and interest to know what was done by some, but it is much more important to know what was said of it by others—that is, not merely how it was performed, but how it was taken. We learn something far beyond the mere facts by observing whether they are recorded as the extravagancies of fanatics, the infirmities of good men, the sins of bad men, or the exploits of heroes.

"This Bertrand, being a silk-weaver, went to Wesel, for the cause of religion, who being desirous to draw his wife and children from Dornick to Wesel, came thrice from thence to persuade her to go with him thither. When she in no wise could be intreated, he, remaining a few days at home, set his house in order, and desired his wife and brother to pray that God would establish him in his enterprise that he went about. That done, he went upon Christmas day to the high church of Dornick, where he took the cake out of the priest's hand, as he would have lifted it over his head at mass, and stamped it under his feet, saying that he did it to shew the

glory of that God, and what little power he hath: with other words more to the people, to persuade them that the cake or fragment of bread was not Jesus their Saviour. At the sight hereof the people, being struck with a marvellous damp, stood all amazed. At length such a stir thereupon followed, that Bertrand could hardly escape with life."—*Fox*, vol. iv. p. 393.

In this, as in the case of Gardiner, the authorities seem to have supposed that there was some secret which it was worth while to find out by tormenting the prisoner. Like Gardiner, however, he confessed nothing, (I presume had nothing to confess,) and declared his satisfaction in the act, affirming "that if it were a hundred times to be done he 'would do it; and if he had a hundred lives he would give 'them all in that quarrel."

Another case of much the same sort may be added from the account of what took place in our own country. I mean that of William Flower, "the martyr of God," who, as he said, "compelled by the Spirit," went into St. Margaret's, Westminster, on Easter Sunday, 1555; and finding the priest at the altar, and on the point of giving the sacrament to the people, drew his hanger and attacked him, cutting at his head and his arm, so that "the chalice with consecrated hosts being in his hand were sprinkled with his blood."[1] In this case, as in that of both the others, the act did not proceed from sudden impulse, for he stated that he had gone to "Paul's church (so called) upon Christ's Day, in the morning, to have done it," but had been prevented from fulfilling his intention.

Such cases as these may, I suppose, be considered as instances of honest and straightforward enthusiasm; which, though they are to be deplored, and perhaps blamed, do yet command pity, if not something like respect, for the unhappy actors. Had they lived at a later period, it is probable that they would have been treated neither as felons nor martyrs, but as persons irresponsible at the moment, but who might perhaps by time and patient teaching be brought to see that whether their opinions were right or wrong, their mode of enforcing them was injurious to their fellow men, and must be displeasing to Almighty God.

This bold and honest style of aggression, practised by

[1] Fox, vol. vii. p. 75.

men as sad as they were fierce, was the fruit of something altogether different from the sly spirit of insult and provocation which suggested "many *ludicrous* things *everywhere* done in *derision* of the old forms and of the images," of which I have already given a specimen in the preceding essay. Another may be here briefly mentioned, which is more to our immediate purpose, because it occurred as early as the first year of Edward VI.

"In this year 1547, and in the month of October, there fell out an accident in St. John's College in Cambridge, which made those of that College that favoured learning and religion (as that house was the chief nursery thereof in that university) judge it highly necessary to apply themselves to the Archbishop, to divert a storm from them. The case was this; a french lad of this college, cizer to one Mr. Stafford there, had one night, in hatred to the mass, *secretly* cut the string, whereby the pix hung above the altar in the chapel. The like of which was indeed done in other places of the nation by some zealous persons, who began this year, without any warrant, to pull down crucifixes and images out of the churches: as was particularly done in St. Martin's, Ironmonger-lane, London."—*Strype's Cranmer*, I. 231.

It is of the next year that Strype tells us—

"There were not a few, who, towards the declining of this year, did, more openly and commonly than before, speak of the holy Sacrament with much contempt. Which, to speak the truth, the former idolatrous and superstitious doctrines thereof had given great occasion to: so that men *condemned in their hearts and speech the whole thing*, and reasoned unreverently of that high mystery: and in their sermons, or readings, or communication, called it by vile and unseemly terms. *They made rhymes, and plays, and jests of it.* And this occasioned chiefly by the misuse of it: as it is expressed in the Act of Parliament of the first of Edw. VI. cap. 1. Therefore was that Act of Parliament made, being the very first act of this King. And to back this act, especially when these contemptuous dealings with the Sacrament continued still, and ceased not, the King sent forth a severe proclamation, December 27, against these irreverent talkers of the Sacrament."—*Strype, Mem.* II. i. 126.

Again, the same writer says—

"Sacred places, set apart for divine worship, were now greatly profaned; and so probably had been before by ill custom: for in many churches, cathedral as well as other, and especially in London, many frays, quarrels, riots, bloodsheddings were committed. They used also commonly to bring horses and mules into and through churches, and shooting off hand-guns: 'making the same which were properly appointed to God's service and common-prayer, like a stable or common inn, or rather a den or sink of all unchristiness;' as it was expressed in a proclamation which the King set forth

about this time, as I suppose, (for I am left to conjecture for the date,) by reason of the insolency of great numbers using the said evil demeanors, and daily more and more increasing: 'therein forbidding any such quarrelling, shooting, or bringing horses and mules into or through the churches, or by any other means irreverently to use the churches, upon pain of his Majesty's indignation, and imprisonment.' For it was not thought fit that, when divine worship was now reforming, the places for the said worship should remain unreformed.

"Beside the profanation of churches, there prevailed now another evil, relating also to churches, *viz.* that the utensils and ornaments of these sacred places were spoiled, embezzled, and made away, partly by the churchwardens, and partly by other parishioners. Whether the cause were, that they would do that themselves, which they imagined would ere long be done by others, *viz.*, robbing the churches: which, it may be, those that bore an ill will to the reformation might give out, to render it the more odious. But certain it is, that it now became more or less practised all the nation over, to sell or take away chalices, crosses of silver, bells, and other ornaments."—*Strype's Cranmer*, vol. i. p. 251.

It may perhaps be proper to speak of these public acts of the government hereafter. In the meantime we must, as I have already said, go back to a still earlier period to get a right view even of the times of which Strype is here speaking. The reader is not to suppose that when Strype said that some over-zealous persons "*began* this year, without any warrant to pull down crucifixes and images out of the churches," that he meant to represent this as something previously unthought of. The thing, whether right or wrong, was not new. The spirit which gave rise to it, as well as this peculiar manifestation, had long been familiar. Fox's story of the Rood of Dover Court, and the other events which he mentions, as either earlier or contemporary with it, will illustrate this. They belong, it must be observed, to the years 1531 and 1532, and therefore bring us back very nearly to the time when Thomas Cromwell rode to London to "make or marre." Fox tells us—

"In the same year of our Lord 1532, there was an idol named the Rood of Dover-court, whereunto was much and great resort of people: for at that time there was great rumour blown abroad amongst the ignorant sort, that the power of the idol of Dover-court was so great, that no man had power to shut the church-door where he stood; and therefore they let the church-door, both night and day, continually stand open, for the more credit unto their blind rumour. This once being conceived in the heads of the vulgar sort, seemed a great marvel unto many men; but to many again, whom God had blessed with his Spirit, it was greatly suspected,

especially unto these, whose names here follow: as Robert King of Dedham, Robert Debnam of Eastbergholt, Nicholas Marsh of Dedham, and Robert Gardner of Dedham, whose consciences were sore burdened to see the honour and power of the Almighty living God so to be blasphemed by such an idol. Wherefore they were moved by the Spirit of God, to travel out of Dedham in a wondrous goodly night, both hard frost and fair moonshine, although the night before, and the night after, were exceeding foul and rainy. It was from the town of Dedham, to the place where the filthy Rood stood, ten miles. Notwithstanding, they were so willing in that their enterprise, that they went these ten miles without pain, and found the church-door open, according to the blind talk of the ignorant people: for there durst no unfaithful body shut it. This happened well for their purpose, for they found the idol, which had as much power to keep the door shut, as to keep it open; and for proof thereof, they took the idol from his shrine, and carried him a quarter of a mile from the place where he stood, without any resistance of the said idol. Whereupon they struck fire with a flint stone, and suddenly set him on fire, who burned out so brim, that he lighted them homeward one good mile of the ten.

"This done, there went a great talk abroad that they should have great riches in that place: but it was very untrue; for it was not their thought or enterprise, *as they themselves afterwards confessed*, for there was nothing taken away but his coat, his shoes, and the tapers. The tapers did help to burn him, the shoes they had again, and the coat one sir Thomas Rose did burn; but they had neither penny, halfpenny, gold, groat, nor jewel.

"Notwithstanding, three of them were afterwards indicted of felony, and hanged in chains within half a year after, or thereabout. Robert King was hanged in Dedham at Burchet; Robert Debnam was hanged at Cataway-Cawsey; Nicholas Marsh was hanged at Dover Court: which three persons, through the spirit of God at their death, did more edify the people in godly learning, than all the sermons that had been preached there a long time before.

"The fourth man of this company, named Robert Gardner, escaped their hands and fled; albeit he was cruelly sought for to have had the like death. But the living Lord preserved him; to whom be all honour and glory, world without end!

"The same year, and the year before, there were *many images* cast down and destroyed *in many places;* as the image of the crucifix in the highway by Coggeshall, the image of St. Petronal in the church of Great Horksleigh, the image of St. Christopher by Sudbury, and another image of St. Petronal in a chapel of Ipswich.

"Also John Seward of Dedham overthrew a cross in Stoke park, and took two images out of a chapel in the same park, and cast them into the water."—Vol. iv. p. 70[illegible].

But without entering on the task of tracing this spirit in our country in earlier periods, or even when first it flourished under the fostering care of Cromwell, we may get a glimpse of what it grew to be under his patronage, by looking at the

very meagre record, or rather the scattered and not always perhaps impartial notices, which we have of the proceedings that took place under the celebrated Act of Six Articles; which, whatever other reasons may have been assigned for it, appears to have been passed principally to meet and repress the rampant spirit of blasphemy which seemed to have been let loose upon the country for its destruction. But as this is a matter of great importance, and one which has been, I believe, somewhat misrepresented, let us in the first place inquire respecting the facts.

It is not necessary to take up room with a repetition of the Act of Six Articles, which the reader who wishes it may easily find, as there is no intention to deny that it required the belief (or at least forbade the questioning, which really is rather a different question) of several Romish doctrines, especially that of the real presence, under the severest penalties. Our inquiry is not doctrinal but historical; not so much what the Act might have done, as what it was intended to do, and what it actually did. It was passed in the parliament which sat in the year 1539, and came into force as law on the 12th day of July in that year. According to Strype, it "was intituled *An Act for abolishing of 'Diversity of Opinions:* and because of the rigorous Penal-'ties, and the Blood that was shed thereupon, was called, '*The Bloody Act of Six Articles.*"[2]

Burnet tells us—

"This Act was received, by all that secretly favoured Popery, with great joy; for now they hoped to be revenged on all those who had hitherto set forward a Reformation. It very much quieted the Bigots; who were now perswaded that the King would not set up Heresie, since he passed so severe an Act against it; and it made the total Suppression of Monasteries go the more easily through. The Popish Clergy liked all the Act very well, except that severe branch of it against their unchast practices. This was put in by Cromwel, to make it cut with both edges. (Some of our inconsiderate Writers, who never perused the Statutes, tell us it was done by a different Act of Parliament; but greater faults must be forgiven them who write upon hearsay.) There was but one comfort that the poor Reformers could pick out of the whole Act, that they were not left to the Mercy of the Clergy, and their Ecclesiastical Courts, but were to be tryed by a Jury; where they might expect more candid and gentle dealing. Yet the denying them the benefit of Abjuration, was a severity beyond what had ever been put in practice before: so

[2] Mem. I. i. 543.

now they began to prepare for new storms and a heavy persecution." —*Hist. of Ref.*, vol. i. p. 248.

Perhaps if it had been the reader's own case, he would not have exactly liked to represent it as a very great hardship, that he was not allowed to utter his opinions with the comfortable consideration, that if they got him into trouble he might slip out by abjuring them. He would have hesitated about saying to his friends, "I should like to preach the gospel amazingly, but the fact is, that under this atrocious, newfangled statute, what you say you must stand to." But without stopping here to discuss Bishop Burnet's ideas of honesty and martyrdom, it should be observed, and I think it will hereafter more fully appear, that this law was principally made to repress the filthiness and foolish talking of those who had no reverence for sacred things, who lived by railing and scoffing at them, and who had no principle which should prevent their abjuring or perjuring anything that might come in their way. But as to "new storms, and a heavy persecution," for that is the principal point at present, let us have the testimony of Holinshed:—

"In this parlement the act of the Six Articles was established. Of some it was named the *bloodie* statute, as it proved indeed to manie. And euen shortlie after the making thereof, when the first inquest for inquirie of the offendors of the same statute sat in London at the Mercers chappell, those that were of that inquest were so chosen foorth for the purpose, as there was *not one* amongst them that wished not to have the said statute put in execution *to the vttermost*, insomuch that they were not contented onelie to inquire of those that offended in the Six Articles conteined in that statute, but also they deuised to inquire of certeine branches (as they tooke the matter) belonging to the same," &c.

After some further account of the Inquest in London, and of some persons who were troubled by it, but received the royal pardon, and of whom I hope to speak more particularly presently, he goes on to say—

"But although the King at that present granted his gratious pardon, and forgaue all those offenses: yet afterwards, during the time that this statute stood in force, which was for the space of eight years insuing, they brought many an honest and simple person to death. For such was the rigor of that law, that if two witnesses, true or false, had accused anie, and aduouched that they had spoken against the sacrament, there was no waie but death; for it booted him not to confesse that his faith was contrarie, or that he said not as the accusers reported, for the witnesses (for the most part) were beleeued."—Vol. iii. p. 946.

Strype says, that "very sad and amazing were the resentments of the sober and religious side, while this was transacting, and hardly yet compleated," and he afterwards puts as a marginal note, "many burnt upon this act," though the text to which that note is annexed tells us that

"The Lord Crumwel did his endeavour to protect the gospellers from burning, the punishment appointed in this act, *but could not:* yet the Penalty of these Articles did not *so much* take place during his life, who died about a year after: but after his death *a cruel time passed.* Commissioners were appointed in every Shire, to search out and examine such as were refractory. And few durst protect those that refused to Subscribe to the Articles; so that they *suffered daily,* as we shall see under the next year. But it was the Lord Herbert's observation, 'Their punishment did but advance their religion; and it was thought they had some assistance from above, it being impossible otherwise that they should so rejoice in the midst of their torments, and triumph over the most cruel death.'"—*Mem.* I. i. 545.

It is true that this statement has the authority of Lord Herbert, who, in his Life of Henry VIII., says—

"And now a cruell time did passe in England; for as few durst protect those who refused to subscribe to the 6. Articles, so *they suffered daily,* wherof Fox hath many examples: neither was it easie for any man to escape (Commissioners being appointed in every Shire to search out and examine those who were refractory) nevertheless, their Punishments did but advance their Religion; for as they were notified abroad, and together their constancy represented, who were burnt. It was thought they had some assistance from above, it being impossible otherwise that they should so rejoyce in the midst of their torments, and triumph over the most cruell death."[3]

Surely a reader who knows no more of the facts than what he may gather from these writers, would expect to find, as the story went on, that torrents of blood were shed, and the number of the slain incalculable. He might, indeed, consider the fact, that "the cruel time," (not to say *any* enforcement of the Act,) did not begin till more than a year after the "bloody Six Articles" had passed, as indicating a strange degree of moderation, or impotence, in those who had framed it in bloodthirsty vengeance, and this might lead him to suspect exaggeration in the historians. But would he not think that he made all due allowance, if he dated the persecution from after the death of Cromwell, and finding that thenceforth "they suffered daily," he assumed the charitable

[3] *Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 466, in the edition of 1649. I do not know what edition Strype used, but his reference is to p. 530.

minimum of one sufferer per day for all England, and so limited his idea of the number of martyrs to somewhat more than five-and-twenty thousand? Would he not be startled if one told him that he would have to look sharp for five-and-twenty, and might dismiss the thousands as being figures, not of arithmetic, but of speech? It may be a confession of ignorance, but I must say that I have not found so many. I have not indeed made such inquiry as would authorize my speaking positively and with precision. But precision is not wanted in such a matter. If, beside the cases which I am about to mention, twice or ten times as many others can be produced of persons undeniably put to death under the Act, it will in no degree invalidate my argument, or justify the writers whose language I have quoted.

It will be observed that Lord Herbert refers us to Fox; and there can, I presume, be no doubt that his Martyrology is the original authority of all. Let us then turn to it, and see what testimony it gives. Fox tells us:—

"In this parliament, synod, or convocation, certain articles, matters, and questions, touching religion, were decreed by certain prelates, to the number especially of six, commonly called 'The Six Articles,' (or 'The Whip with Six Strings,') to be had and received among the King's subjects, on pretence of unity. But what unity thereof followed the groaning hearts of a great number, and also the cruel death of divers, both in the days of King Henry, and of Queen Mary, can so well declare as I pray God never the like be felt hereafter."—Vol. v. p. 262.

After having given the "sum and effect of the doctrine of these wicked articles in the BLOODY ACT contained," he adds, by way of preface to the penalties of it,

"After these Articles were thus concluded and consented upon, the prelates of the realm craftily perceiving that such a foul and violent Act could not take place or prevail unless strait and BLOODY penalties were set upon them, they caused, through their accustomed practice, to be ordained and enacted by the King and the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in the said parliament, as followeth," &c.

But after all this, what does Fox give as the result? I may have missed some cases of martyrdom in turning over his pages; but as it will not occupy much room, I will give a list of *all the martyrs whom Fox mentions as having been put to death during the time that the Act was in force*—that is, during the last seven years of Henry the Eighth's reign.

How far some of them had any thing to do with the Six Articles, the reader who chooses may inquire; but if they are all set to that account, they will go a very little way towards justifying the romance of history; or to speak more properly, the declamatory falsehoods of party and passion.

(1) *Barnes*, (2) *Garret*, and (3) *Jerome*, were burned two days after the death of Crumwell, and therefore more than a year after the Act came into force. Strype says in one place that Barnes "suffered death upon the six articles."—(*Cran.* I. 93.) But elsewhere, "In this year without any trial, or sentence of condemnation, or calling him to answer, and two others with him, was Dr. Barnes burnt at Smithfield."—(*Mem.* I. i. 568.) And it seems that they were in fact burned upon a special act of attainder. Fox says, "there ensued process against them by the King's Council in Parliament."—(Vol. v. p. 434.) Burnet says, "They lay in the Tower till the Parliament 'met, and then they were attainted of heresie, without ever being 'brought to make their answer. And it seems for the extraordinari-'ness of the thing, they resolved to mix attainders for things that 'were very different from one another. For four others were by the 'same act attainted of Treason, who were *Gregory Buttolph*, *Adam* '*Damplip*, *Edmund Brindholme*, and *Clement Philpot*, for assisting 'Reginald Pool, adhering to the Bishop of Rome, denying the King 'to be the supreme Head on earth, of the church of England, and 'designing to surprise the town of Callice. One *Derby Gunnings* 'was also attainted of Treason, for assisting one Fitz-Gerald, a 'traitor in Ireland. And after all these, *Barnes*, *Gerard*, and *Jerome*, 'are attainted of heresie, being, as the act says, 'detestable heretics, 'who had conspired together to set forth many heresies; and taking 'themselves to be men of learning, had expounded the Scriptures 'perverting them to their heresies, the number of which was too long 'to be repeated: That *having formerly abjured*, they were now incor-'rigible heretics; and so were condemned to be burned, or suffer 'any other death, as should please the King.'" (Hist. of Ref. vol. i. 'p. 283.) That is, I suppose, they were treated just as relapsed heretics would have been centuries before the Six Articles were heard of, except that, perhaps, as Collier remarks, "By the Act of Attainder, upon which they were burnt, it appears, the Parliament had for once, taken the cognizance of religious belief from the bishops courts, and made themselves judges of heresie."—(Vol. ii. p. 183.) The Act for "Thattaynder of *Butolph*, *Damplipp*, *Brind-holme*, *Philpot*, *Gȳnyng*, *Barnes*, *Geratt*, *Jerome*, and *Carew*," is specified in the chronological table prefixed to the Statutes of the Realm, published under the Record Commission, vol. iii., p. (xxxvi.) as the 32. Hen. VIII., cap. 60, but it is among those which are "not printed." My reason for saying so much of it here will be apparent presently.

(4) *Mekins.*—Fox gives "A Note how Bonner sat in the Guildhall in commission for the Six Articles: also of the condemning of Mekins;" and therefore without stopping to inquire exactly when,

or where, or why he was burned, none of which points are very clearly set forth in Fox's narrative, we will suppose that he suffered under the Act.—*Fox*, V. 440,—and somewhat improved, *Burnet*, I. 285.

(5) *Spencer*, (6) *Ramsey*, (7) *Hewet*.—"About the same time," says Fox, referring, I suppose, to the untold time when Mekins suffered, "also a certain priest was burned at Salisbury, who, leaving his papistry had married a wife, and became a player in interludes, with one Ramsey and Hewet, which three were all condemned and burned; against whom, and especially against Spencer, was laid matter concerning the sacrament of the altar. He suffered at Salisbury."—*Fox*, V. 443. This is all the account. Short as it is, Burnet has prudently abridged it to, "Three others were also burned at Salisbury, upon the same statute, one of whom was a priest." (Vol. i. p. 286.) By the time that Burnet wrote, the stage-playing would not have added to the respectability of a priest, though the priesthood might add to that of a martyr.

(8) *Bernard*, (9) *Morton*.—"About the same time," says Fox, though it does not clearly appear with what reference, "John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln burned two upon one day, the one named Thomas Bernard, and the other James Morton; the one for teaching the Lord's Prayer in English, and the other for keeping the Epistle of St. James translated into English."—*Fox*, V. 454. This is all the account; and however heinous these offences might seem to Bishop Longland, or any one else, it is plain that they had nothing to do with the Six Articles. Burnet only says, "Two also were burned at Lincoln in one day." (Vol. i. p. 286.) He was probably ashamed to assign so absurd a reason as that given by Fox. However we will count them in.

(10) *Testwood*, (11) *Peerson*, (12) *Filmer*, were burned at Windsor on July 28th, 1543; that is, rather more than four years after the Act of Six Articles had come into operation. *Fox*, V. 486. Strype says that they were condemned "upon the Six Articles." (*Cran.* I. 157.) Burnet tells us that Gardiner "moved the King in Council, that a Commission might be granted for searching suspected houses at Windsor, in which it was informed there were many books against the Six Articles." (Vol. i. p. 311.)[4]

[4] I do not understand this, though it is probable that there was such a search, and that it led to the prosecution of these persons under the Act; because, though, on the one hand, (as I have just observed with reference to the case of Morton,) it does not appear that the possession of heretical books was an offence under the Act, yet, on the other, that Act gave the fullest power to the Commissioners to search for heretical books, and destroy them. Surely there was no need for Bishop Gardiner to move the King in Council for any such Commission while the Act contained this clause: "And it is also enacted by thauctoritie abovesaid that 'the said Commyssioners and every of them, shall from tyme to tyme 'have full power and auctoritie by vertue of this acte to take into his or 'their kepinge [or] possession all and all manner of books, which bene 'and hath bene, or hereafter shalbe, set forth read or declared within this 'Realme, or other the King's Dominions, wherein is or ben conteyned or

(13) *Damplip.*—Fox tells us that, after one narrow escape, "the good man was again apprehended by the miserable inquisition of the Six Articles;" and therefore it is right that I should mention him; but I apprehend that his case is sufficiently illustrated by what has been just said of the Act of Attainder in the notice of Dr. Barnes, and that whoever looks into his history will find, not that he suffered as a protestant martyr, but that he was hanged as a popish traitor. See *Fox*, V. 520. But let us count him.

(14) *A poor labouring man* was "reported" to Fox as having been burned in Calais, apparently some time before the return of Damplip.—*Fox*, V. 523[5].

(15) *Dodd*, a Scotchman, suffered also at Calais about a year afterwards. His history is comprised in seven lines, which inform us that he was found to have German books, and "standing constantly to the truth that he had learned was therefore condemned to death, and there burned in the said town of Calais."—*Fox*, V. 524.

(16) *Saxy.*—"Coming now to the year of our Lord 1546," (that is seven years after the passing of the Act), Fox either affects merit, or makes apology, I really know not which, for "passing over the priest whose name was Saxy, who was hanged in the porter's lodge of Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and that, as it is supposed, not without the consent of the said bishop, and the secret conspiracy of that bloody generation." This is all that I find about it; whether, if anything of the sort occurred, it was done by virtue of the Six Articles, the reader will judge for himself.—*Fox*, V. 531.

'comprised any clause article matter or sentence repugnant or contrarie 'to the tenor forme or effecte of this present acte or any of the articles 'conteyned in the same: And the saide Commissioners, or thre of them 'at the least to burne or otherwise destroy the saide books, or any parte 'of them, as unto the saide Commissioners or unto thre of them at the 'lest shalbe [thought] expedient by their discrecions."—*Stat. of the Realm*, vol. iii. p. 743. (See also the bottom of p. 271, forward.)

[5] At p. 498 of the same volume of Mr. Seeley's (or as it might really be called the Comic) edition of Fox, this and the preceding case are crushed into one; and we read of "Adam Damlip, a poor labouring man." The unfortunate editor does not seem to have observed, that only a few lines below, on the very same page, he was editing a further account of "Adam Damlip, who had been, in time past, a great papist, and chaplain to Fisher Bishop of Rochester; and after the death of the bishop his master, had travelled through France, Dutchland and Italy." Indeed, if the editor had observed all this, it probably would not have engendered in his mind any suspicion that the man might not be quite protestant on the point of the Supremacy. But this is not the place to go into the subject of the Calais treason and troubles, on which the reader may find much interesting matter in Fox, and also in Mr. Nichols's valuable and interesting Chronicle of Calais, lately published by the Camden Society, to which I have before had occasion to refer; and probably much more in the authorities which he indicates, but which I have not seen.

(17) *One Henry* and (18) *his servant* are also passed over by Fox in the same sentence. He merely says, "to pass over also one Henry, with his servant, burned at Colchester; I will now proceed to the story of Kerby," &c. I am not aware that in any other part of his history he gives any further explanation.

(19) *Kerby*, and (20) *Clerke*, for whose sake the two preceding martyrs are passed over in less than six lines, were apprehended at Ipswich. The former suffered at that place on the 29th, and the latter at Bury on the 31st of May, 1546. *Fox*, V. 530.

(21) *Anne Askew* suffered in the month of July in the same year 1546.—*Fox*, V. 537.

(22) *Lacels*, (23) *Adams*, and (24) *Belenian* were burned with Anne Askew. *Fox*, V. 550. I do not see that he gives any account of their opinions, or of the circumstances which led to their suffering. Burnet, on what authority I do not perceive, says, "they were all convicted upon the statute of the Six Articles, for denying the Corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament."—I. 327.

(25) *One Rogers*, is stated by Fox to have "suffered martyrdom for the Six Articles" "much about the same year and time," (as Anne Askew I suppose) by means of Bishop Repse's influence with the Duke of Norfolk.—*Fox*, V. 553.

(26) *John*, a painter, (27) *Giles Germain*, (28) *Launcelot* one of the king's guard. Fox recollects, somewhat out of place, that "about the year of our Lord 1539" (and therefore probably before the Act of Six Articles was enforced, if, indeed, it had been passed) the two former had been "accused of heresy." The third coming in "by chance" while they were under examination, and seeming "by his countenance and gesture to favour both the cause, and the poor men," they were all three burned.—*Fox*, V. 654.

This is, I believe, a list of all the persons whom Fox mentions as having been condemned to death in the eight years between the passing and the repeal of the Act. If I have overlooked any, or more can be furnished from another source, I shall be glad to be informed. It is not worth while to prolong an essay already so prolix, with any additional remarks respecting the truth or the relevancy of any of the stories; or after having so long detained the reader on the subject of what the Act did *not* do, now to break into the important question respecting what it did. I hope in another essay to pursue this inquiry, and to show, by some observations on its origin, design, and effect, that though the law did not do what it was never meant to do, and what party writers pretend that it did, yet it was not a dead letter, but was meant to do, and actually did, a great deal.

ESSAY XIII.

THE RIBALDS. No. III.

If it should have appeared to any reader of the preceding Essay, that the Act of Six Articles was almost inoperative, he may be inclined to inquire how that came to pass. The Act did not drop from the clouds, or spring out of the earth, but issued from a government composed of various, and even jarring elements, and in which every enactment relating to this class of subjects, indicated at least the temporary predominance of a certain party—that is, in fact, of a certain and very small number of individuals.

Whatever degree of influence the Commons might have then attained, nobody supposes that the statute was extorted from the Crown by the people.

Neither does anybody think that it was the work of the Reformers; or, in other words, a trick of Cromwell and Cranmer.

But many persons do suppose, and naturally enough if they adopt the statements and suggestions of Fox and his transcribers, that it was the work of the popish party, and that its object was to exterminate the Reformers, root and branch. Take, for instance, the flourish with which Fox begins his account of the martyrdom of Doctor Barnes and his companions, which, as has been already stated, took place immediately after the fall of Cromwell:—

"Like as in foreign battles the chief point of victory consisteth in the safety of the general or captain, even so, when the valiant standard-bearer and stay of the church of England, Thomas Cromwell I mean, was made away, pity it is to behold what miserable slaughter of good men and good women ensued thereupon, whereof we have now (Christ willing) to entreat. For Winchester, having now gotten his full purpose, and free swing to exercise his cruelty, wonder it was to see that 'aper Calydonius,' or, as the scripture speaketh, that 'ferus singularis,' what troubles he raised in the Lord's vineyard. And lest, by delays, he might lose the occasion presently offered, he straightways made his first assaults upon Robert Barnes, Thomas Garret and William Jerome, whom in the very same month, within two days after Cromwell's death, he caused to be put to execution."—Vol. v. p. 414.

But if Gardiner and a party with him had such a purpose, and were strong enough to procure a statute which gave them their "full swing," how are we to account for their doing so little with it? If, despite their opponents, they had power to carry the measure, and keep it unrepealed for eight years, surely when the measure was carried they must have had power to make use of it. Surely, if things had really been such as would justify Fox's language, the popish party *must* have done much—very much—more than he has thought of charging them with.

But there was another—and in the popular view, a distinct—power, which had, I apprehend, the most to do with it. I speak of this power as distinct in the popular view, rather than in reality, because I believe that, if ever two men with as much difference of nature, knowledge, aims, and circumstances, could be said to concur in anything, then were Gardiner and his Royal master of one mind in the business of the Six Articles. At the same time, whatever Gardiner might suggest, or agree to, or do, in the matter, there seems to be no doubt that it was truly and properly the king's own act and deed, performed by his own lusty will, without much anxiety as to what either papist or protestant or parliament thought about the matter.

Few things have had a greater tendency to involve the history of the English Reformation in obscurity than the loose way in which the king's own personal feelings, and opinions, and his proceedings with regard to religion, have been estimated and represented. With reference to the present case, even Lord Herbert says, "But that it may 'seem lesse strange why the King, who before was much 'disposed to favour the Reformers, did on a sudden so 'much vary from them, I have thought fit to set down 'some of the motives as I conceive them."[1] But it seems hardly worth while to follow him into his ideas respecting the jealousy of the foreign Reformers, and the emperor, and other remote reasons which he suggests, while it is so apparent that he is only troubling himself to solve a difficulty which never existed. Undoubtedly Henry "was much disposed to favour the Reformers" who took his part

[1] Life of Hen. VIII., p. 448.

in the divorce question—he "was much disposed to favour the Reformers" who maintained that he was the supreme head of the church, and sided with him against the unjust usurpations of the Bishop of Rome—he "was much disposed to favour the Reformers" who carried through the suppression of the monasteries, and thereby not only humbled the pride of those who might be more strictly called the popish clergy, but filled his exchequer, or enabled him to be profuse with an empty one. For the same reason, and because the thing was somewhat scandalous, and sometimes supported by disgraceful trickery, he thought it right to stop the lavish offerings which were heaped on the shrines of some of the more popular saints, and to turn those treasures to more useful purposes—and we cannot wonder if, with these views and feelings, he did not altogether dislike or disrelish some things having a tendency to lower the papal power in his dominions, by rendering the pope and his adherents ridiculous. All this was certainly very antipapal; and if to be antipapal was to be protestant, this was very protestant, and the king was very protestant; and it might be very protestant to give his subjects the bible in the vulgar tongue—a circumstance very curious and much to be remarked in connexion with the matter now before us; because, that it was the work of Cromwell (or perhaps we may say of Cromwell and Cranmer) admits of no doubt. But how would Henry have stared if anybody had inferred from any or all these things that he had any heretical misgivings or doubts about transubstantiation, or purgatory, or the invocation of saints, or other doctrines which we justly consider as errors or heresies peculiarly characteristic of the Church of Rome, and which in the modern popular view of the Reformation in England are commonly mixed up with the doctrine of papal supremacy, in the general notion of "popery." This point is well stated by Hooper in a letter which he wrote to Bullinger, several years after the Act of Six Articles had passed, and it is highly worthy of our attention.

"Accept, my very dear master, in few words, the news from England. As far as true religion is concerned, *idolatry is nowhere in greater vigour*. Our king has destroyed the Pope, but not popery; he has expelled all the monks and nuns, and pulled down their monasteries; he has caused all their possessions to be transferred

into his exchequer, and yet they are bound, even the frail female sex, by the king's command, to perpetual chastity. England has at this time at least ten thousand nuns, not one of whom is allowed to marry. The impious mass, the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious abstinence from meats, and purgatory, *were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment.*"[2]

Again, nearly a year afterwards he says;—

"The bearer will inform your excellence of the good news we received yesterday from Strasburgh. There will be a change of religion in England, and the King will take up the gospel of Christ, in case the Emperor should be defeated in this most destructive war: should the gospel sustain a loss, he will then retain his impious mass, for which he has this last summer committed four respectable and godly persons to the flames."[3]

Very pregnant was the exclamation of Latimer before Edward the VI., "The bloud of Hales, woe worth it; what 'a doe was it to bring it out of the King's head! This 'great abomination of the bloud of Hales could not be 'taken for a great while out of his minde."[4] But without multiplying illustrations where they are unnecessary, I will just add one, not only because it is curious and characteristic in itself, but because it may be well to refer to it on another account hereafter. It is from a work intitled, "The Lamentacyon of a Christen againste the Citye of London, for some certaine greate vyces vsed therin."[5] After speaking of the sums given to priests "to synge in a chauntrie to robbe the lyuynge God of hys honoure," the author proceeds;—

"Ye wyll saye vnto me, what arte thou, that callest these thinges vncommaunded tradycyons and popyshe ceremonyes, seyinge the Kynges Grace forbyddeth them not, and vseth parte of them hym

[2] Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, First portion, lately published by the Parker Society, p. 36, where the Editor gives the date as "probably 1546."

[3] Orig. Lett. ubi supra, p. 41. These persons the Editor states to have been Anne Askew, and those who suffered with her.

[4] Sermons, fol. 84. *b*. edit. 1584, quoted in Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog., 2nd edit., vol. ii. p. 281.

[5] The copy from which I extract is said on the title-page to have been printed in 1548. I do not see that Herbert mentions the edition; but he specifies two others, one said to be "printed at Jericho in the land of Promise," 1542, the other, at Nuremberg, 1545.—*Herbert's Ames*, III. 1553, 1558. (xxx. 8. 14.)

selfe? I answere that ye vse manye thynges contrary to the kyngs iniunccyons. And yf it be that God through the kynge hath caste out the deuell out of this realme, and yet both he and we suppe of the broth in which the deuell was soden, and that God hath yet not opened the eyes of the kynge to set all thynges in right frame, and vtterly to breake downe the serpent, as Ezechias the kynge dyd .iiii. Reg. ix. and as kynge Asa dyd .ii. Chro. xiiii take it thus, that euen your iniquytye wyth callynge vpon vayne Goddes, and sekynge saluacion by a wronge waye, is the veri cause that God closeth vp the eies of the kynge, as of one that heareth and vnderstandeth not, and seeth and perceyueth not."—*Sig.* b. iiii. *b.*

It seems plain that though the king was persuaded to consent to the abolition of some things clearly superstitious, yet it was done with difficulty; and it evidently required all the power and address of those who wished him to go much farther, to get him to go as far as he did. But Cromwell might have tried in vain to get him to join in railing at the mass, and Cranmer as vainly to get his approbation of a married clergy. I believe that he was roused by an idea that the church, of which he was resolved to be the supreme head, was likely to be overthrown by a torrent of what he considered infidelity and blasphemy, and that he devised, and insisted on, and would have, and carried, such a measure as he thought was suited to check the frightful evil.

Such, I believe, to have been the origin of the Act. Subsequent events show that it was meant to frighten rather than to hurt, to intimidate and quiet the people rather than to destroy and slaughter them by wholesale. Nothing but the spirit of party and passion, the withering blight of all truth in history, can represent it as a statute seriously intended to be executed according to the letter. But it did much without proceeding to such extremities as it threatened. It was meant to frighten the people, and it did frighten them; and by that means it did two things which, whether right or wrong, good or bad, were undoubtedly of very great importance at that time, and in their consequences. In the first place, it caused many of the more violent partizans of the Reformation to quit the country; and secondly, it made those who stayed at home more quiet and peaceable. Fox has given us "A brief table of the Troubles at London in the time of the Six Articles," which he prefaces by saying;—

"Although this inquisition above mentioned was meant properly and especially concerning the Six Articles, yet so it fell out, that in short space doubts began to arise, and to be moved by the quest: whether they might inquire as well of all other opinions, articles, and cases of Lollardy, or for speaking against holy bread, holy water, or for favouring the cause of Barnes, of friar Ward, Sir Thomas Rose, &c.: whereupon *great perturbation followed in all parishes almost through London* in the year aforesaid, which was 1541, as here ensueth in a brief summary table to be seen."—Vol. v. p. 443.

It is very principally on account of the curious light which this Table throws on the state of things at the time, that I have been induced to say so much of the Statute which gave rise to it. And therefore, as Fox says;—

"Having discoursed the order of the six articles, with other matter likewise following in the next parliament, concerning the condemnation of the lord Cromwell, of Dr. Barnes, and his fellows, let us now (proceeding further in this history) consider what *great disturbance and vexations* ensued after the setting forth of the said articles, *through the whole realm of England*, especially among the godly sort: wherein first were to be mentioned the straight and severe commissions sent forth by the king's authority, to the bishops, chancellors, officials, justices, mayors, and bailiffs in every shire, and other commissioners by name in the same commissions expressed; and, amongst others, especially to Edmund Bonner bishop of London, to the mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen of the same, to inquire diligently after all heretical books, and to burn them. Also to inquire after all such persons whatsoever, culpable or suspected of such felonies, heresies, contempts, or trangressions, or speaking any words contrary to the aforesaid act, set forth, of the Six Articles."—Vol. v. p. 440.

Strype, who generally follows Fox, and sometimes, without meaning to falsify, rather improves his statements, tells us—

"Upon the Six Articles, commissions were granted out by the King to the Bishops, and their Chancellors and Officials, and to all Justices of Peace, Mayors, and Sheriffs in every shire, and others named in the same commissions; to inquire diligently upon all heretical books, and to burn them, and upon all persons suspected of such felonies, contempts, or transgressions against the act of the Six Articles.

"To London, and the diocese thereof, was a particular commission sent for this purpose. The Commissioners were the Bishop of London, Roche the Mayor, Allen, Warren, Richard Gresham, Knights and Aldermen, Roger Cholmley, Knight, Sergeant at Law, John Gresham, Michael Dormer, the Archdeacon of London, the Bishop's Commissary, Chidley, Crayford, Edward Hall, Brook,

Morgan. And that these might be sure to do their office, a letter was procured from the King to Boner the Bishop, or his Commissary, to give all these their oaths for the execution of the said act. The form of which oath was prescribed in that act. The Bishop accordingly, at Guildhall, administered the said oath to them. And then the jury were sworn; when the Bishop admonished them to SPARE NONE. So in all parishes throughout London almost, some were summoned and accused, and brought into trouble, to the number of near two hundred. Several also of Calais, and of divers other quarters, were brought into trouble. So that all the prisons in London were too little to hold them."—*Mem.* I. i. 565.

Perhaps, when it had been stated that "commissions were granted out by the King to *the bishops*," it was hardly necessary to specify that "to London, and the diocese thereof, was a particular commission sent"—or, as Fox oddly expresses it in a passage already quoted, "amongst others, especially to Edmund Bonner bishop of London." But it must be remembered that this bishop of London was "bloody Bonner," who ought by all means to have the "bloody" act saddled upon him in some peculiar manner, though he does not appear to have had more to do with it than the other official persons named in the act itself, and thereby appointed to carry it into execution. Still it is so natural, and so like the "butcherly" bishop, that we should almost have taken it for granted, even if Strype had not told us, that when he had sworn the jury, he admonished them to "SPARE NONE." Burn them all. Men, women, and children. The ignorant and those that are out of the way. The misled, the faint, the feeble, even the penitent—SPARE NONE.

It is really almost enough to put one out of conceit with all history, when one sees so good a man as Mr. Strype undoubtedly was, writing in such a way as this; and what reader goes to Fox, the only writer whom Strype quotes, to see whether he has fairly represented his authority? Fox tells us that "When the two juries were sworn, Bonner 'taketh upon him to give the charge unto the juries, and 'began with a tale of Anacharsis, by which example he 'admonished the juries to spare no persons, *of what degree* 'soever they were." Now it seems to me that this most materially alters the state of the case. One can hardly doubt that the "example," which the bishop quoted from Anacharsis, was his well-known saying, that laws were like

cobwebs, which caught flies while they were easily broken through by stronger insects. Surely there was no presumption in the Bishop of London's taking upon him to charge the juries, and the tone of the charge, even on Fox's showing, was very different from that which a reader of Strype would suppose. If "bloody" Bonner had been a favourite, we should probably have been told, that he faithfully and conscientiously warned the jury against a pharisaical show of zeal in haling to the judgment-seat the defenceless poor, the weak, and the foolish, while they took bribes from their rich neighbours to connive at their heresy, or "spared" them because they had the means, not only of defence, but of retaliation.

But what if, instead of these miserable, and tiresome, and invidious explanations, one were fairly to take the bull by the horns, and ask Mr. Strype and all the world, whether it was the duty of a sworn jury to exercise the prerogative of "sparing" persons, when they were simply sworn to find and present facts? What should we think of a jury who should come into court and say, "We find that A has robbed B; we are quite sure that he is a felon—but in our discretion we spare him—and our verdict is 'Not Guilty'?" Was Bonner requiring from the juries more than all the commissioners themselves were bound to? Their oath, as given by Fox, was;—

"Ye shall swear, that ye, to your cunning, wit, and power, shall truly and indifferently execute the authority to you given by the king's commission, made for correction of heretics and other offenders mentioned in the same commission, without any favour, affection, corruption, dread, or malice, to be borne to any person or persons, as God you help, and all saints."—Vol. v. p. 264.

But to come to the more immediate subject of inquiry—what did these juries do, what did they find, and what sort of crimes did they present? for the object is to get some idea of the real state of things in the year 1541, and of what was actually passing in the houses and churches, in the taverns, and by the firesides, of London. One is tired of being told over and over again, in general terms, that the furious bishops destroyed all who favoured the gospel without mercy; and one would like to know the grounds, or even the alleged grounds and pretences, on which they did it.

We must, however, always bear in mind, that we have this account from a friendly hand; and considering that Fox tells us, that the good Lord Awdley assured the king that *all* the people were presented out of malice, I may (and truth absolutely requires that I should) add, one that was not very scrupulous. But we must take the matter as Fox gives it, and form our ideas of "the persons presented, with the causes of their presentation," as well as we can from the information which he has seen fit to give on the subject.

Of course a great many of these causes of presentation are given by Fox in such brief and general terms, and often in terms so purely descriptive of negative offences, that we gain but little light from them. But there are a good many others which are more particular; and even from such as are couched in rather indefinite language, we may learn something. We do not, for instance, get very accurate knowledge from the word "despising," as it is used in this Table. When we read that Mrs. Cicely Marshall of St. Alban's parish, was accused of "*despising* holy bread and holy water;" and her fellow-parishioner, "Anne, Bedikes wife, of *despising* our Lady;" of three in St. Giles without Cripplegate, presented for "*despising* auricular confession," and five others in the same parish for "*despising* holy bread and holy water;" of ten in the parish of St. Martins at the Well with two buckets, for "*contemning* the ceremonies of the church;" of John Humfrey of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, for "*speaking against* the sacraments and ceremonies of the church;" and also (unless it was some fellow-parishioner of the same name) with three others for "*depraving* of matins, mass, and even-song;" there is room for a charitable hope that in any particular case the offence was nothing more than that of withholding some of the external marks of devotion which the heresies and idolatries sanctioned by the church of Rome had rendered customary. We cannot tell how these persons manifested their despite; none, we may hope, so grossly as Richard Bigges of St. Magnus parish, who showed that he was guilty of "*despising* holy bread" by "putting it in the throat of a bitch."

Perhaps, *too*, we can hardly judge of such cases as Brisley's wife of St. Nicholas in the Flesh Shambles, who was presented "for *busy reasoning* on the new learning, and not

keeping the church;" but it gives occasion to remark (what will be obvious to any one who looks over the *Tabls*), that so great a proportion of the offenders were females. We have had one or two instances already; and one of the ten parishioners of St. Martin's (just mentioned by only that description) stands in the Table as "Mother Palmer." Whether she obtained this title of respect from her being in any way considered a "mother in Israel," I do not know; but Mrs. Elizabeth Statham of St. Mary Magdalene's in Milk-street, seems to have been something of the kind, for her offence was "maintaining in her house Latimer, Barnes, Garret, Jerome, and divers others." Perhaps she was content to sit as a learner in the prophet's chamber which she had made; but Margaret Ambsworth of St. Botolph's without Aldgate, was presented, not only "for having no reverence to the sacrament at sacring time," but also "for instructing of maids, and being a great doctress." One is inclined to suspect something of the same spirit in Martyn Bishop's wife, of St. Benet Finck, who "did set light by the curate" when he spoke to her about her not confessing in Lent, and receiving at Easter. Mrs. Castle, too, of St. Andrew's, Holborn, was presented "for being a meddler," as well as for another species of conduct, very naturally concomitant, and of which I shall say more presently, but in the meantime, she was, as I have said, a "meddler," and so no doubt, in the estimation of the jurors, were her fellow-parishioners, Robert Plat and his wife, who "were great reasoners in scripture, saying that they had it of the Spirit;" and so the eight parishioners of St. Mary Woolchurch, who were "great reasoners and despisers of ceremonies;" and Thomas Aduet, John Palmer, and Robert Cooke of St. Michael, Queenhithe, for "the cause laid to these persons was for reasoning of the scripture, and of the sacraments;" and John Cockes of the same parish, for "this man was noted for a great searcher out of new preachers, and maintainers of Barnes's opinions." All these persons, and many others, were no doubt considered as "meddlers," though not described by that name; but we have no proof that they "meddled," as Mrs. Castle did, in a way that was then very common, and requires more particular notice.

Let us give—who, even of the thoughtless and the worthless, can help giving?—not merely pity, but honour and

respect to the man who suffers for conscience' sake, even if he is ignorant, weak, or mistaken; but let us not be so far imposed on by the declamation of party, as to imagine that the protestantism with which Henry the Eighth had to deal, was simply a system of meek endurance and patient suffering—a pure spirit of heaven dragged from its hiding-place on earth by fiends infernal, whose only mission was to find and torment it. It cannot be denied that there was something aggressive in its character; and one of its modes of displaying this quality was by disturbing the services of the church. I have already noticed cases in which this was done by some fanatics with great force and violence, by striking the priest, and overthrowing or trampling on the elements. But these were extraordinary cases. It is not fair to make any cause responsible for all the fanatics whom it may engender; for no cause which does not engender some is worth maintaining. But there were milder, and more common modes of aggression. Thus the four parishioners of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, who have been already noticed as "despising holy bread," were also presented for "letting divine service." How they did it we are not told; nor do we get more precise information respecting four parishioners of St. Mildred in Bread-street, who "were presented for interrupting the divine service." Master Pates of David's Inn, and Master Galias of Bernard's Inn, both of the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn, were presented "for vexing the curate in the body of the church, in de-'claring the King's Injunctions, and reading the bishop's 'book, so that he had much ado to make an end;" and beside being included in this joint accusation, Master Galias was individually presented "for withstanding the curate censing the altars on Corpus Christi Even, and saying openly that he did naught." If the reader has not lost sight of Mrs. Castle the "meddler," he may remember that she belonged to the same parish, and it must now be added that she was presented, not only as a meddler, but as "a reader of Scripture in the church."

To a modern reader, that is, a reader acquainted with only modern feelings and usages, it may seem odd to find a woman charged with such an offence; and, indeed, the whole matter is so alien from that with which we are familiar in practice, that it requires a little illustration.

The idea of taking any book to church, except a Bible or Prayer Book, would seem strange to us. Some readers may not at once think of the Companion to the Altar as a singular exception, and a relic of old times, and others may be surprised to learn that the Statutes of Trinity College, Cambridge, given by Queen Elizabeth in the second year of her reign, distinctly recognize the right, and thereby imply the custom, of carrying into chapel at service time, not only the Scriptures and books containing devout prayers or meditations, but the sermons of any holy father or doctor[6]. We must not therefore think that the reformers did anything very strange when they took books with them to church; and, saying nothing of any little demonstration such as human nature when it is sectarianized cannot help, we must confine the offence to the taking in of unlawful books, or the using them to disturb the service.

It may have been observed in a preceding essay, that when William Gardiner went to the church at Lisbon, he was occupied during the service with reading on his New Testament. This was probably an English Testament, and he might have pleaded (as we shall see that William Hastlen did) that he was employing his time more profitably than in listening to service in a language which he could not understand. There was not the same excuse for Thomas Benet of Exeter, who "wrote his mind in certain scrolls of paper, 'which, in secret manner, he set upon the doors of the 'cathedral church of the city; in which was written 'the 'Pope is Antichrist; and we ought to worship God only 'and no saints.'" Fox tells us, "there was no small ado," and "the bishop and all his doctors were as hot as coals, 'and enkindled as though they had been stung with a sort

[6] I do not know what may have been the law or custom at other colleges. The statute to which I refer, however, was in force at Trinity College till very lately; certainly till within these ten years. How long, and to what extent, it was acted on in this particular, I do not know. At the only period when I had much opportunity of observing, the taste of the young men generally did not lie that way; but I presume that a procession of undergraduates, with folios of Taylor, Barrow, Tillotson, &c., under their arms, would have had little to fear from the dean. "Nemo 'ad sacellum tempore rei divinæ faciendæ alios libros adferat quam 'psalterium, aut alios hujusmodi libros, qui pias precationes meditation-'esse contineant, aut Sacra Biblia, aut pias conciones alicujus sancti 'patris aut doctoris."—*Cap.* XVI.

'of wasps. Wherefore, to keep the people in their former 'blindness, order was taken that the doctors should in haste 'up to the pulpit every day and confute this heresy. 'Nevertheless, this Thomas Benet, keeping his own doings 'in secret, went the Sunday following to the cathedral 'church to the sermon, and by chance sat down by two 'men, who were the busiest in all the city in seeking and 'searching for this heretic; and they, beholding this Benet, 'said the one to the other, 'surely this fellow, by all likeli-'hood, is the heretic that hath set up the bills, and it were 'good to examine him.' Nevertheless, when they had well 'beheld him, and saw the quiet and sober behaviour of the 'man, his attentiveness to the preacher, his godliness in the 'church, being always occupied in his book, which was a 'Testament in the Latin tongue, they were astonied, and 'had no power to speak unto him, but departed, and left 'him reading in his book." [7]

It is not exactly to our precise point, perhaps, but it contributes somewhat to illustrate the manners and spirit of the times and persons with whose history we are engaged, to observe that Anne Askew tells us, that when she was brought before Bishop Bonner, "he commanded his archdeacon to commune" with her, and "then," she adds, that is, after a general inquiry as to the cause of her trouble, "took he my book out of my hand, and said, 'Such books 'as this have brought you to the trouble that you are in. 'Beware,' said he, 'beware, for he that made this book, and 'was the author thereof, was a heretic I warrant you, and 'burned in Smithfield.' And then I asked him, if he were 'certain and sure that it was true that he had spoken. 'And he said, he knew well the book was of John Frith's 'making." She afterwards says, that she opened the book, and showed the archdeacon that it was not that which he supposed, but she does not tell us what it was. I mention

[7] Vol. v. p. 19. How a man who was "always occupied in his book," could be remarkable for "his attentiveness to the preacher," it is not easy to understand, unless we suppose the narrator to mean, that when he was not attending to the preacher, he was occupied in his book—or, in other words, that he showed himself remarkably attentive to the sermon, and remarkably occupied by his Testament during the prayers. This seems probable in itself, and there must of course have been some sort of demonstration to waken the suspicion, and elicit the suggestion, of his neighbours.

the circumstance chiefly as showing, that at such a time and place she had her book in her hand; for our business is at present with those who, like Mrs. Castle, were readers of the Scripture in the church; and the Table before us, beside the general statements already cited about letting and interrupting divine service, mentions several cases in which it was done in this particular manner. Andrew Kempe, William Pahen, and Richard Manerd of St. Alban's Parish, were presented "for disturbing the service of the church with brabbling of the New Testament," and one of the offences charged against William Plaine was, that "when he came to the church, with loud reading the English Bible, he disturbed the divine service."

One of the most interesting and instructive accounts of such a case, however, is recorded in the Appendix to Fox's Martyrology, under the title of "A Note of a certain good man troubled in Boulogne the first year of King Edward the Sixth, for the Gospel." It begins thus:—

"The examination of me, William Hastlen, gunner in the castle of High Boulogne, in the year of our Lord 1547, and the first year of the reign of king Edward the sixth. As I was in the church of Boulogne, called the Stals, upon the 12th of April, being Easter Tuesday, reading of a godly book, called 'The Lamentation of a Christian against the citizens of London,' between the hours of three and four at afternoon, there came certain men to me as I stood at an altar in the church reading to myself, and asked me what good book I had; and I said, they should hear if they pleased. Then they desired me to read out that they might hear, and so did I very gladly; but I had not read long (the priests and clerks were at their Latin evensong, I reading mine English book) but there came a tipstaff for me, taking my two books from me, and commanded me to go with him; for he said I must go before the council of the town.

"Then went I forth with him; and a little without the church door, sir John Bridges met us, and bade the tipstaff carry me to sir Leonard Beckwith, knight, to be examined; and coming before his presence, he asked me what books they were that I had at the church: and was reading of one of them openly in the church to the people. And I said, so far as I had read them they were good godly books. And he said, they were heresy. And with that he asked me how I did believe of the sacrament of the altar, whether I did not believe that to be the very body of Christ, flesh, blood, and bones: and I asked him whether he meant that that was in the pix or no? and he said, Yea, even that in the pix. And I said, that since I had sure knowledge of Scriptures, I did not believe it to be the body of Christ, but a bare piece of bread; nor by God's help will I ever believe it otherwise to be. Then he said, I was a heretic, and asked me what I made of the Sacrament: and I said, if it were duly

ministered according to Christ's institution, that then I did believe that the faithful communicants, in receiving that blessed sacrament, did receive into their inward man or soul, the very body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Then said he, 'Dost thou not believe it to remain the very body of Christ after the words of consecration pronounced by the priest?' And I said, No. Then said he, 'What dost thou make of the Church?' I said, 'As it is now used, it is a den of thieves, and the synagogue of Satan.' 'Thou heretic,' said he, 'there remaineth the very body of Christ. But I said, that Christ being God and Man, dwelleth not in the temples made with men's hands. Much other communication had we at that time, but this was the effect that day. Then he asked me whether I would be forthcoming till to-morrow. And I said, 'Sir, if you think that I will not, you may lay me where I shall be so.' Then he let me go for that night, and said, 'We shall talk further with thee to-morrow;' so I departed home.

"And about the space of two hours after, master Huntingdon the preacher (which did much good with his preaching in Boulogne at that time) came to me, and said, that he heard me spoken of at my lord Gray's, who was then lord deputy of the town and country of Boulogne; 'and I perceive,' said he, 'that you are in great danger of trouble, if you escape with your life: for there are some of the council marvellously bent against you.' I said, 'The Lord's will be done.' 'Well,' said he, 'without you feel in yourself a full purpose, by God's help, to stand earnestly to the thing that ye have spoken, you shall do more hurt than good. Wherefore,' said he, 'if you will go to Calais, I will send you where you shall be well used, and be out of this danger.' Then I thanked master Huntingdon, saying, 'I purpose by God's assistance to abide the uttermost that they can do unto me.' 'Well then,' said he, 'I can tell you you will be sent for to-morrow betimes before the whole council.' 'That is,' said I, 'the thing that I look for.'

"Then rose I betimes in the morning and went into the market-place, that I might spy which way the officer should come for me. I had not tarried there long, but I spied a tipstaff, and went toward him, and asked him whom he sought; and he said, 'a gunner of the great ordnance in the castle of Boulogne;' and I said, 'I am he:' then said he, 'You must go with me to my lord's:' and I said, 'Therefor I looked.'

"When I came there, I saw my lord and the whole council were assembled together in a close parlour. Doing my duty to them, my lord said to me, 'It is informed me that thou hast seditiously congregated a company together in the church, and there in the time of service thou didst read unto them an heretical book, and hast not reverently used silence in the time of the divine service. What sayest thou to this?'

"I said, 'If it please your honour, I was in the church a good while before any service began, and nobody with me, reading to myself alone, upon a book that is agreeable to God's word, and no heresy in it that I read; and when it drew towards service time, there came men to the church, and, some of them coming to me whom I knew not, asking me what good book I had, I said it was a

new book that I had not yet read over. Then they prayed me that I should read so that they might hear some part with me; and so I did, not calling, pointing, nor assembling any company to me. And the service being in Latin, that for the strangeness of the tongue, besides much superstition joined with it, was not understood of the most part of them that said or sung it, much less of them that stood by and did hear it; whereas, by the word of God, all things in the church or congregation should be done to the edifying of the people, and seeing I could have no such thing by their service; I did endeavour to edify myself, and others that were desirous of reading godly books. And because the church is so abused contrary to the word of God, being beset round about with a sort of abominable idols, before whom no man ought to kneel, nor do any manner of reverence, because the scriptures do curse both the idol and the idol-maker, and all that do any worship or reverence unto them, or before them, for that cause I used no reverence there.'"—Vol. viii. p. 715.

I have already (at p. 207) given the reader some account of this book which William Hastlen was reading aloud in the church at Boulogne, and one extract from it, which might perhaps suffice to show that it was not exactly what a Christian, guided by the pure and peaceable wisdom that is from above, would have chosen for his lecture at such a time and place; but it is quite worth while to give some further extracts, which will more fully illustrate its character, and show that the offence taken by the popish party was, to say the least, very natural. Imagine the "gunner of the great ordnance" opening such a fire as this, in the church, and during the service:—

"Thynke ye that God hath not as moche to laye to the charges of London for killinge hys seruantes, as he had agaynst Jerusalem for killinge hys Prophetes? Yes, yes; For Goddes sake ye that be elders repent and geue your selfes to readinge the lawe of the Lord, that ye may be an example to the commons in godlye conversacion: And in the scriptur ye shall lerne what to do, ande what to leaue vndone, and howe to knowe false Prophetes, and how to cast them out of your conscyens, where they haue sytten a long time, euen in the stede of God: I meane not the Byshoppe of Rome alone, but he and all hys marke wyth him, and specialy his owne generacion, which are all in forked cappes.

"What a plage is this, that in no mans tyme aliue was euer any Christen Bisshope raininge ouer the Citye of London, but euery one worsse then other? I thynke theyr can now come no worsse, except the same Lucyfer that fell from heauen, come himselfe, whyche is the very father of all Popyshe Byshops."—*Sig.* c.

"O ye Babylonyshe Bishoppes and generacion of Vipers, where haue ye yovr auctoryte? or how dar ye be so bold to kyll a man for his faith whych Christ neuer ded nor hys Apostelles? For it is a

gyfte which no man can eyther geue an other or yet hym selfe. No no, it is the gyft of God onely. Ande that must be geuen a man before he can eyther do or thynke goode. For all that is done without fayth is synne. Roma. in the xxiiii. and Hebre. xi.

"No, nor ye put no man to death for Christes sake, but for that that no man should either preache teache or wrytte Chryst aryght, which he can not do, but he shall by force be constrained of the holye Ghost to wryte agaynst your pompe, pryde, vyle lyuinge, and against your abhomynable sedusing of the people, leadynge them in an endlesse mase of dyrtye tradicions and folyshe ceremonyes.

'And why can not a man set forthe Christ but he must write agaynst yow? Euen bycause ye be the very Antichristes. No I saye it is not possible for anye man sent of God, either to preache or wryte, but he must open hys mouthe against that moost wycked abomynable, and detestable Antychryst, of ROME, as agaynste the enemy of Chryst, which be you false Bysshops, false Prophetes, that beare the false signe of the newe lawe and the olde lawe, with stoute stronge and sturdie Archdeacons, Deanes, and Chanons of Cathedrall Churches and other your pytymembers prestes of Baal."—*Sig.* d. vii. *b.*

"O ye deuelles, ye blind guides and seducers of the people, howe of late bewitched you the Parlament house? Euen by your inuencions and deuelishe studie haue ye caused actes and decrees to be made, so cleane contrarye to the lawes of the lyuinge God, that I saye vnto you, the verie bearewolfe, that abhominable whore of Rome neuer made so cruell actes. He neuer made it dethe for a preste to marye a wife, &c."—*Sig.* e. iiii.

This is perhaps a sufficient specimen, and it brings us back to the Act of Six Articles; and therefore, very naturally, to a case of which I wish to take some notice, for several reasons. That is, not merely as furnishing an instance of reading the Bible in church, but as giving us a cautionary hint that it is necessary to read such stories with care and attention, lest we fall into misconceptions of their real nature. I mean "The Story of John Porter, cruelly martyred for reading the Bible in Pauls," which I do the rather, because those who look cursorily at that part of Fox's work with which we are at present engaged, may read, "In the number of those before named,[8] cometh the 'remembrance of John Porter, who, in the same year (A.D. '1541), for Reading the Bible in Pauls Church was cruelly 'handled, and that unto death, as you shall hear."

Of course there is something to surprise even those who are not very suspicious, in the statement that a man was

[8] That is, it would seem, in the Table so often mentioned of those who were persecuted for the Six Articles, though I do not observe his name.

put to death for reading the Bible in Paul's Church, when they have just been told that the Bible had been placed there by the bishop of the diocese, in order that anybody who chose might read it. Indeed, Fox continues his story by saying—

"It was declared in this history above, how Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, in the days of the Lord Cromwell, being then ambassador at Paris, was a great doer in setting forward the printing of the Bible in the great volume; promising moreover, that he would, for his part, have six of those Bibles set up in the church of St. Paul in London; which, also, at his coming home, he no less performed, according to the King's proclamation set forth for the same, whereof read before."—Vol. v. p. 451.

And he adds;—

"The Bibles thus standing in Paul's, by the commandment of the king, and the appointment of Bonner the bishop, many well-disposed people used much to resort to the hearing thereof, especially when they could get any that had an audible voice *to read unto them*, misdoubting therein no danger toward them; and no more there was, so long as the days of Cromwell lasted. After he was gone, it happened amongst divers and sundry godly-disposed persons, which frequented therein *the reading* of the aforesaid Bible, that one John Porter used sometimes to be occupied in *that godly exercise*, to the edifying as well of himself, as of other. This Porter was a fresh young man, and of a big stature; who, by diligent reading of the scripture, and by hearing of such sermons as then were preached by them that were the setters-forth of God's truth, became very expert. The Bible being then set up, by Bonner's commandment, upon divers pillars in Paul's church, fixed unto the same with chains for all men *to read in them* that would, great multitudes would resort thither to hear this Porter, *because he could read well*, and had an audible voice. Bonner and his chaplains, being grieved withal (and the world beginning then to frown upon the gospellers), sent for the said Porter, and rebuked him very sharply *for his reading*. But Porter answered him that he trusted he had done nothing contrary to the law, neither contrary to his advertisements, which he had fixed in print over every Bible."—*Ed.* 1596, p. 1100.

The reader who has got thus far in the history of John Porter, probably thinks that he has made a considerable progress towards understanding his case. He may wonder to find a man brought before Bishop Bonner for the simple act of reading the Bibles which Bishop Bonner himself had set up, and still (Cromwell or no Cromwell, it seems) kept up, in his cathedral; and to learn that the bishop put him to death for it. He may, however, consider that it would be mere folly to attempt to account for the cruel freaks of

such a sanguinary monster; and that the only way to meet the difficulty is to say, "Whether Bonner put the Bibles up, or put the Bibles down, his object was blood. No doubt his secret orders to the myrmidons whom he sent to spy out the proceedings of the Bible-readers in Pauls were to 'SPARE NONE.'"

But, whatever surmises may have arisen in the minds of those who have read the matter contained in the preceding pages of this essay, the unprepared and confiding reader of Fox will, by what has been hitherto said, learn absolutely nothing (one might almost say less than nothing) of the real case. It may be hard to say, particularly, and in detail, what was the charge against the prisoner; for, so far, it has been studiously suppressed in the story; and it only just crops out in the sequel sufficiently to show us, that to represent John Porter as "cruelly martyred for reading the Bible in Pauls" is historically (and yet more verbally) as untrue as to say that John Thurtell was put to death for firing a pistol. Whatever were John Porter's offences, we may safely join issue with Fox, and deny that it was "for reading the Bible;" and that, too, on his own showing, for he immediately goes on to say, "Bonner then laid unto his charge that he had made *expositions* upon the text, and gathered *great multitudes* about him *to make tumults.*"

These were the very things particularly forbidden in the "Admonition" set over the Bibles, to regulate the behaviour of those who should see fit to use them. It directed "that no number of people be specially congregate therefore to *make a multitude*, and that no *exposition* be made thereupon;" and these were the very things which the Bishop laid to the charge of John Porter. And he charged him, not only with these things, forbidden in themselves, but with a much more serious offence—namely, with doing these things in order *to make tumults*. We have only the *ex parte* statement given us by Fox; but does he venture to say that the charge was false? Not at all. Does he represent John Porter himself as denying it? Not at all. When Bonner made the charge, "he answered, he trusted that should not be proved by him." A most prudent and characteristic reply. But, having recorded this discreet answer, not a word more does Fox say of the charge, or the

examination, or the defence. He seems as if he suddenly felt that he had said quite enough, or too much; and he huddles up the story, leaving his readers in a state of great ignorance, but surely not without a strong suspicion that there was a good deal more in the matter than he chose to tell. His very next words to those which I have just quoted are, "But, in fine, Bonner sent him to Newgate, where he was miserably fettered in irons."—"In fine," surely his jumping to such a point, when the reader naturally supposed that he was at the beginning of a story, is very suspicious: and this instance, among many others, may very usefully instruct us not to receive the stories of party writers without some care and examination.

But as to the matter which has led to its being brought forward on this occasion—namely, the reading in churches to which the Reformers were addicted—perhaps enough has been said for our present purpose; and I hope to proceed to the notice of some persons whose offences still more urgently called for the interposition of authority.

ESSAY XIV.

THE RIBALDS. No. IV.

PERHAPS I have given enough specimens to show the nature of a spirit which was abroad when the Act of Six Articles was passed, and which that statute was particularly intended to meet.

We may readily believe Fox when he tells that "great perturbation followed in all parishes almost through London." The Table given by him, and from which the foregoing cases are quoted, contains the names of more than two hundred "persons presented," and one would naturally suppose that, thus presented by those who were charged to "SPARE NONE" to those who gave the cruel Charge, the next thing must have been, that they were put to death without mercy.

Let the reader look back to Holinshed's statement, that "such was the rigour of that law, that if two witnesses, true

'or false, had accused anie, and advouched that they had 'spoken against the sacrament, there was no waie but 'death;"[1] and to the statements of Lord Herbert and Strype, that they "suffered daily," and did "triumph over the most cruel death."[2]

Really, after all this preparation for the sublime and terrible, the simple facts of the case must seem, to any candid inquirer, to approach the ridiculous. He will hardly credit me when I tell him that as to the whole of this motley assemblage of offenders, the Chancellor was "content that one should be bound for another;"—and that upon this pleasant and commodious bail, "they were *all discharged*," being bound only to appear in the Star Chamber, the next day after All Souls, there to answer, if they were called; "but," Fox honestly and quaintly adds, "neither was there any person called, neither did there any appear."[3]

Add to this what I have already said respecting the real number of persons who suffered under the statute during the eight years that it was law, and I think we may form a tolerable opinion of the reason which led to its being originally passed, and subsequently maintained without being kept in fierce operation.

But we have not yet the whole case before us; nor even the worst part of it. There was, as I have already stated, another class of even more gross offenders, against whom the Act of Six Articles was particularly directed. So many instances have been given of what may be described as a mocking and jesting spirit intruding itself into churches and deriding the divine service, that I should not have added more on this occasion, had it not occurred to me to give one which, by its date, will show that there was such a spirit in action long before the time which we usually understand by the period of the Reformation. "We find," says Fox, "that in the year of our Lord 1431, one 'Nicholas Canon of Eye, was brought before the Bishop of 'Norwich for suspicion of heresy, with certain witnesses 'sworn to depose against him touching his manners and 'conversation; which witnesses appointing one William 'Christopher to speak in the name of them all, he deposed

[1] Cited p. 256. [2] Cited p. 257. [3] Vol. v. p. 451.

'in manner and form following:" and then he gives the depositions, from which it is worth while to make one or two extracts.

"First, That on Easter-day, when all the parishioners went about the church of Eye solemnly in procession, as the manner was, the said Nicholas Canon, as it were mocking and deriding the other parishioners, went about the church the contrary way, and met the procession.—This article he confessed, and affirmed that he thought he did well in so doing.

* * * * *

"Item, That on Corpus Christi day, at the elevation of high mass, when all the parishioners and other strangers kneeled down, holding up their hands, and doing reverence unto the sacrament, the said Nicholas went behind a pillar of the church, and turning his face from the high altar, mocked them that did reverence unto the sacrament.—This article he also acknowledging, affirmed that he believed himself to do well in so doing.

"Item, When his mother would have the said Nicholas to lift up his right hand, and to cross himself from the crafts and assaults of the devil, forasmuch as he deferred the doing thereof, his mother took up his right hand and crossed him, saying, 'In nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.' Which so ended, the said Nicholas, immediately deriding his mother's blessing, took up his right hand of his own accord, and blessed him otherwise; as his adversaries report of him.—This article the said Nicholas acknowledged to be true.

"Item, That upon Allhallows-day, at the time of the elevation of high mass, when many of the parishioners of Eye lighted many torches, and carried them up to the high altar, kneeling down there in reverence and honour of the sacrament, the said Nicholas, carrying a torch, went up hard to the high altar, and standing behind the priest's back saying mass, at the time of the elevation, stood upright upon his feet, turning his back to the priest, and his face towards the people, and would do no reverence unto the sacrament.—This article he acknowledged, affirming that he thought he had done well in that behalf."—Vol. iii. p. 599.

Coming, however, to the class of offenders to whom I have referred, and recurring to Fox's Table, so often quoted in the foregoing Essay, we find that William Plaine, of whom it has been there stated, that "*when* he came to the 'church [a phrase which seems to indicate that it was not 'often] with loud reading the English Bible be disturbed 'the divine service," was also charged, that "seeing a priest going to *mass*," he "said, 'Now you shall see one in *masking*.'" This jingle of words was common in the party, and appears to have been particularly popular in his parish of St. John's, Walbrook, where William Clinch seems to

have made it a standing joke; for the presentment (which is for using nearly the same words) runs, "for saying when he seeth a priest preparing to the mass," &c. By indulging the same vein of humour, John Hardyman, priest of St. Martin's in Ironmonger-lane, came to be presented for "preaching openly that *confession* is *confusion*, and[4] *deformation;*" and John Mailer, grocer, of St. Botolph's, Billingsgate, "for calling the sacrament of the altar 'the baken god,' and for saying that the *mass* was called beyond the sea *miss*, for that all is a*miss* in it." These things may be considered trifles, but they are genuine, even if they are to be considered mild, emanations of the ribald spirit; and I mention them here as such, and as illustrative of the state of society at the period.

But a more open and more flagrant manifestation of this spirit was given by Henry Patinson and Anthony Barber, of St. Giles's-without-Cripplegate, who were presented "for maintaining their boys to sing a song against the sacrament of the altar," and Thomas Grangier and John Dictier, of the same parish, were "noted for *common singers* against the sacraments and ceremonies." Nicholas Newell, a Frenchman, of St. Mary Woolchurch, was "presented to be a man far gone in the new religion, and that he was a great *jester* at the saints, and at our Lady." Shermons, Keeper of the Carpenter's Hall, in Christ's parish, Shoreditch, "was presented for procuring an *interlude* to be 'openly played, wherein priests were railed on and called 'knaves." "Giles Harrison, being in a place without Ald-

[4] One cannot but suspect that much of the jest is lost by the reporter, or the printer, having here left out a word—perhaps *confirmation*. Should any reader think it improbable that confirmation should be so disrespectfully spoken of, he may be referred to George Marsh's account of "How the Bishop [of Chester] came to Lancaster, and of his doings there in setting up *Idolatry*." He tells us that "The Bishop being at Lancaster, 'there set up and confirmed all *blasphemous idolatry;* as holy-water-'casting, procession-gadding, mattins-mumbling, *children-confirming*, 'mass-hearing, idols-upsetting, with such heathenish rites forbidden by 'God." It is sad to read such ribaldry as this; but even more melancholy to see such an absurd comment on it as Mr. Cattley has appended in the form of a note: "As the Romish church continues to this day the 'idolatry of the mass, which ought to be made a service tending to God's 'glory, so it appears that even the holy rite of *Confirmation* was made 'an offence to some, in the manner in which it was administered."—*Fox*, Vol vii. p. 47.

'gate, merrily jesting in a certain company of neighbours, 'where some of them said, 'Let us go to mass:' 'I say, 'tarry,' said he; and so taking a piece of bread in his 'hands, lifted it up over his head: and likewise taking a 'cup of wine, and bowing down his head, made therewith a 'cross over the cup, and so taking the said cup in both his 'hands, lifted it over his head, saying these words, 'Have 'ye not heard mass now?' for the which he was presented 'to Bonner, then Bishop of London."

I presume, however, that Giles Harrison was one of those who became bail for each other; and certainly there was a moral beauty and fitness in making that good office mutual —indeed, a sort of necessity; for if they had not done it for each other, how would they have got it done at all? But is it not strange, after all we have read, to find Fox writing thus?—

"In declaring the dreadful law, before set forth, of the Six Articles, which was A.D. 1540, ye heard what penalty was appointed for the breach of the same, in like case as in treason and felony; so that no remedy of any recantation would serve. This severity was a little mitigated by another parliament, holden afterwards, A.D. 1544, by which parliament it was decreed, that such offenders as were convicted in the said Articles for the first time, should be admitted to recant and renounce their opinions. And if the party refused to recant in such form as should be laid unto him by his ordinary, or, after his recantation, if he eftsoons offended again, then, for the second time, he should be admitted to abjure, and bear a faggot: which, if he deny to do, or else, being abjured, if he the third time offended, then he to sustain punishment according to the law, &c. Although the straitness and rigour of the former act was thus somewhat tempered, as ye see, and reformed by this present parliament, yet, notwithstanding, the venom and poison of the errors and mischief of those Articles remained still behind; not removed, but rather confirmed by this parliament aforesaid. By the same parliament, moreover, many things were provided for the advancement of popery, under the colour of religion; so that all manner of books of the Old and New Testament, bearing the name of William Tyndale, or any others, having prologues, or containing any matters, annotations, preambles, words, or sentences, contrary to the Six Articles, were debarred. In like manner, all *songs, plays, and interludes*, with all other books in English containing *matter of religion tending any way against the said Articles*, were abolished."—Vol. v. p. 526.

This brings us back to the subject of songs and interludes, of which something has already been said, and on which a great deal that is curious and illustrative might be added

but for the present I pass it over briefly, merely observing that it requires some effort in the minds of men of this generation to conceive such a state of things. We have just read of men in London charged with "maintaining their boys to sing a song against the sacrament of the altar," and of two others who were stated to be "common singers against the sacraments and ceremonies." They might be unjustly accused, but there is no reason to suppose so, for the thing was evidently common enough. Take, by way of specimen, a case mentioned by Fox, as not at all out of the common way, and as one which in his opinion should engage the sympathy of the reader.

"Here might also be recited the hard adventures and sufferings of John Cornet, and at length his deliverance, by God's good working, out of the same; who, being a prentice with a minstrel at Colchester, was sent by his master, about the second year of Queen Mary's reign, to a wedding in a town thereby, called Rough-hedge, where he being requested by a company there *of good men*, the constables also of the parish being present thereat, to sing some *Songs of the Scripture*, chanced to sing a song called 'News out of London,' which tended against *the Mass*, and against the Queen's misproceedings. Whereupon the next day he was accused by the parson of Rough-hedge," &c.—Vol. viii. p. 578.

But of all things, it is most remote from modern ideas and feelings to find the puritans rejoicing in their alliance with the stage. Bishop Gardiner, in his letter to the Lord Protector, says, "Certain *printers*, *players*, and *preachers* 'make a wonderment, as though we knew not yet how to 'be justified, nor what sacraments we should have;" and Fox puts a sly note in the margin, "Printers, players, and preachers, trouble Winchester;"[5] and afterwards, in commenting on his letter, he says, "He thwarteth and wrangleth 'much against players, printers, preachers. And no marvel 'why: for he seeth *these three things to be set up of God, as* '*a triple bulwark against the triple crown of the Pope to bring* '*him down; as, God be praised, they have done meetly well already;*" and lest this "triple bulwark" should escape the particular notice of the reader, it also has its marginal note, "Preachers, printers, players."[6]

The Protector's answer is well worthy of notice, though to understand it we must observe, that among the offences of these three united professions, Gardiner had particularly

[5] Vol. vi. p. 31. [6] Ibid. p. 57.

specified their railing against Lent. "What rhymes," says the Bishop, "be set forth to deprave the Lent, and how 'fond (saving your grace's honour) and foolish! and yet 'the people pay money for them;" and he afterwards adds—

"The public defamation and trifling with Lent is a marvellous matter to them that would say evil of this realm; for there is nothing more commanded unto us christian men in both the churches of the Greeks and Latins, than Lent is, if all men be not liars. In the king our late sovereign lord's days, this matter was not thus spoken of. And I think our enemies would wish we had no Lent. Every country hath its peculiar inclination to naughtiness: England and Germany unto the belly, the one in liquor, the other in meat; .... and let an English belly have a further advancement, and nothing can stay it. When I was purveyor for the seas, what an exclamation was there (as your grace showed me) of the bishop's fasting-day, as they called Wednesday, and 'Winchester, Winchester, grand mercy for your wine; I beshrew your heart for your water!' Was not that song, although it was in sport, a signification how loth men be to have their licence restrained, or their accustomed fare abated? unless it were in extreme necessity.

"I hear say that the Lent is thus spoken of by Joseph and Tonge, with other new (whom I know not) as being one of Christ's miracles, which God ordained not man to imitate and follow; at which teaching all the world will laugh. For christian men have Christ for an example in all things," &c.—*Fox*, Vol. vi. p. 32.

After arguing this point at some length, the Bishop proceeds;—

"If any man had either fondly or indiscreetly spoken of Lent to engrieve it to be an importable burden, I would wish his reformation; for I have not learned that all men are bound to keep the Lent in the form received. But this I reckon, that no christian man may contemn the form received, being such a devout and profitable imitation of Christ to celebrate his fast; and in that time such as have been in the rest of the year worldly, to prepare themselves to come, as they should come, to the feast of Easter, whereof St. Chrysostom speaketh expressly. And for avoiding contempt, a licence truly obtained of the superior serveth. And so I heard the king's majesty our sovereign lord declare, when your grace was present: and therefore he himself was very scrupulous in granting of licences. And to declare that himself contemned not the fast, he was at charge to have (as your grace knoweth) the Lent diet daily prepared, as if it had been for himself; and the like hereof I hear say your grace hath ordered for the king's majesty that now is; which agreeth not with certain preaching in this matter, nor *the rhymes* set abroad. Lent is, among christian men, a godly fast to exercise men to forbear, and in England both godly and politic, such as without confusion we cannot forbear, as the experience shall show, if it be ever attempted; which God forbid. And yet Lent is

buried in rhyme, and Stephen Stockfish bequeathed not to me, though my name be noted; wherewith for mine own part I cannot be angry, for that is mitigated by their fondness. But I would desire of God to have the strength of this realm increased with report of concord, which doth quench many vain devices and imaginations."—*Ibid.* p. 33.

A few words of the Lord Protector's answer to this I have already quoted in a former essay for another purpose; but it is not worth while on that account here to omit them from a very pregnant and characteristic passage. Perhaps it is possible, and at least it is charitable to hope, that the Protector Somerset did not know that the "magistrate" Cromwell had been anything but "unawares of" the wretched ribaldry which was the subject of the Bishop's complaint.

"The world never was so quiet or so united, but that privily or openly those three which you write of, *printers, players, and preachers*, would set forth somewhat of their own heads, which the magistrates were unawares of. And they which already be banished and have forsaken the realm, as suffering the last punishment, be boldest to set forth their mind; and dare use their extreme licence or liberty of speaking, as out of the hands or rule of correction, either because they be gone, or because they be hid.

"There have foolish and naughty rhymes and books been made and set forth, of the which, as it appeareth, you have seen more than we; and yet, to our knowledge, too many be bought: but yet, after our mind, it is too sore and too cruelly done, to lay all those to our charge, and to ask as it were account of us of them all. In the most exact cruelty and tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, yet Pasquill (as we hear say) writeth his mind, and many times against the bishop's tyranny, and sometimes toucheth other great princes; which thing, for the most part, he doth safely: not that the bishop alloweth Pasquill's rhymes and verses—especially against himself; but because he cannot punish the author, whom either he knoweth not, or hath not. In the late king's days of famous memory, who was both a learned, wise, and politic prince, and a diligent executor of his laws—and when your lordship was most diligent in the same—yet, as your lordship yourself writeth, and it is too manifest to be unknown, there were that wrote such *lewd rhymes and plays* as you speak of, and some against the king's proceedings, who were yet unpunished, because they were unknown or ungotten. And when we do weigh the matter, we do very much marvel, why that about Jack of Lent's lewd ballad, and certain, as it was reported unto us, godly sermons (which be evil in your letters joined together,) you be so earnest, when against Dr. Smith's book, being a man learned in the doctors and scripture, which made so plain against the king's highness's authority, and for the furtherance of the Bishop of Rome's usurped power, your lordship neither wrote nor said anything.—*Ibid.* p. 34."

* * * * *

"Writers write their fantasy, my lord, and preachers preach what either liketh them, or what God putteth in their heads. It is not by and by done, that is spoken. The people buy those foolish ballads of Jack-a-Lent. So bought they in times past pardons and carols, and Robin Hood's tales. All be not wise men, and the foolisher a thing is, to some (although not to the more part) it is the more pleasant and meet. And peradventure of the sermons, there is (and indeed there is, if it be true that we have heard) otherwise spoken and reported to you, than it was of the preachers then and there spoken or meant. Lent remaineth still, my lord, and shall, God willing, *till the king's highness, with our advice and the residue of his grace's council, take another order*, although some light and lewd men do bury it in writing; even as the king's majesty remaineth head of the church; although, through sinister ways, and by subtle means, some traitors have gone about, and daily do, to abuse the king's majesty's supremacy, and bring in the Bishop of Rome's tyranny, with other superstition and idolatry."—*Ibid.* p. 35.

The view of things which we have obtained from the writings of protestants might be much farther illustrated from Strype, and from the various public documents of the period, but that I do not wish to reprint here more than is necessary of matter so easily accessible to all who take any interest in the subject. It is better worth while, if we are willing to hear both sides, and judge fairly, to take one or two extracts from Roman-catholic writers; and if we see anything in them that looks like party feeling, exaggeration, or prejudice, we shall have been prepared to confess that such infirmities were not all on their side, and that too much ground for their complaints was afforded by some who, with no right to be considered reformers themselves, were not sufficiently distinguished from, or repudiated by those who had a better claim to the title.

"JOHN CHRISTOPHERSON," says Strype, under the year 1554, "ere long to be preferred to the deanery of Norwich, 'published also an exhortation upon occasion of the late 'insurrection, directed to all men to take heed of rebellion: 'wherein were set down the causes that commonly move 'men to rebel; and showing that there was no cause that 'ought to move a man thereunto. Printed in 8vo by 'Cawood."[7] The title-page tells us to "Reade the whole,

[7] Mem. III. i. 273. He was an eminent Greek scholar, and Master of Trinity College before he was Dean of Norwich. Whether he held his mastership with the deanery I do not know; but Strype seems to have been mistaken in supposing that he obtained the latter preferment *after* the publication of his book. According to Le Neve, he was installed as

and then judge;" and this it will really be worth the reader's while to do, when he gets the book and has leisure; for it contains much curious matter illustrative of the times; but a few extracts will suffice for our present purpose.

"Besides this, it wold pitie anye good mans hart, to thinke, what disorder and disobedience came of this liberty. Wold not the seruauntes controll their maysters, and tel them, when they were chekked for leauing their busines vndone, that they had bene occupied eyther in readynge God's word, or in hearing some sermon, yea and so godly lessons hadde they learned, since they had tasted of this newe doctrine, that very few of their maysters could after truste them. And if the mayster were a Catholike man, and one that feared God, then wold his seruaunte, if he were of a contrary iudgement, handel hym like a warde, and in maner make a lout of him, and do his busynesse as he list, and when he lyste, and lette it be vndone, if he list. For the mayster fearing, that he shuld have displeasure by him, durst neyther put hym away from hym, nor ones as much as rebuke hym for any matter.

"After the same sorte dyd children order their parentes, wyues their husbandes, and subiectes their magystrates: So that the fete ruled the head, and the cart was set before the horse. For children when they had bene brought vp in schole a while with some lewd Lutherane then would they write letters to their Catholike parentes, and exhorte them in the lordes name to leaue their papistry and blind ignoraunce, that they were in, and fall at lenght to folow goddes worde, and gladly to receaue the truth. And if the parentes would not folowe this their childishe aduise streight way would they not let to talke with their companyons, and tell them, that their parentes were blinde papistes. Yea and make a mery mockinge stocke of them, and say: my father is an old doting foole, and will fast vpon the fryday, and my mother goeth alwayes mumblinge on her beades. But you shall see me of another sorte, I warraunt you. For I will neuer folowe no suche superstitiouse folye, nor walke in the Papisticall pathes of my parentes. Were not men well at ease, trow you, when they had bestowed a great deale of money vpon suche graceles graftes, who neyther feared god, nor reuerenced their parentes?

"Thus did mens wyues to, that were become systors of the new fraternitye, order their husbandes. For where as the husbande dyd not fauoure their secte, then would the wyfe no longer go to schole with hym in silence, as Saynt Paule byddeth her, but would boldlye fall to teach hym, and tell hym of his duety. And many of them

---

dean on April 18, 1554, and if Strype got his information as to the printer from the book itself, one would think he must have seen that it was "Imprynted at London in Paules churcheyarde, at the signe of the holy Ghost, by John Cawood, Prynter to the Queenes highnes. Anno Domini. 1.5.5.4. 24. Iulij. cum priulegio Reginæ Mariæ."; the day of the month actually forming a line by itself.

were offended with Saynte Paule, that hadde commaunded them, that they shuld holde their peace in the churches. For gladly would they haue preached, if they might haue bene suffred, as some of them neuertheles did in corners.

"At which tyme also the deuil, for the better furtherance of heresy, piked out two sorts of people, that shuld in tauerns and innes, at commen tables, and in open stretes set forwarde his purpose, as wel as false preachers dyd in the pulpet; that is to say, minstrels and players of enterludes. The one to singe pestilente and abhominable songes, and the other to set forth openly before mens eyes the wicked blasphemye, that they had contriued for the defacing of all rites, ceremonies, and all the whole order, vsed in the administration of the blissed Sacramentes.

"Then the scripture being in suche folkes handes, was sore studied not for amendement of life, which they neuer mynded, but partly to mayntayne their fonde heresye, wherwith they were infected, partlye to controll the priestes, whome they had in great derision, and partlye to find faulte with other, when they had anye occasion at all. For yf a man were a good vertuous priest, he had bene better a great deale to haue liued amonge Turkes and Saracenes, then amonge this kind of folke: by reason that whensoeuer they mette with him in anye place, they woulde aske him: Now Syr John where fynde you your masse in scripture, or who gaue you aucthoritie to make god? As though the prieste by his owne power had made Christes blessed body in the holye Sacramente of the aultare, and not the holye worde of God. And then wolde they say beside, it is pitie, that anye suche popishe wretches lyues, that thus haue deceaued Christes flocke. But nowe I warrante you must you turne your tippet, and laye away your olde mumpsimus, and shutte vp youre portesse and your Masse boke to, and putte awaye cleane your purgatory Masses. You must now olde foole go to schole agayne, and learne a newe lesson. And agayne whensoeuer they see one of his cote walke by the strete they wolde whistell and hemme at him, and say, go walke in a mischiefe you bald headed knaue. Yea and as yet thys maliciouse mockers cease not in many places, when they can spie a prieste, to play the like part. But thinke you, that suche mockers shal not at length be plaged for their tauntinge of God's ministers, euen as the children were, that mocked Heliseus the Prophete?"—*Sig.* T. i.

"And to make up their malicious mischief withal, plucked they down the pix, wherein the very body of our Lord and Saviour was reserved and kept, and some vile varlets to thintent they might do the Devil their master better service, hurled the same blessed sacrament under their feet, and certain of them would not let to say as the Jews said to our Saviour hanging upon the cross, 'If thou be God save thyself.'"—*Sig.* Vv. *b.*

"As for such as have most wickedly called the Mass a Maskarye, and the priests' vestments, masking clothes, and mocked all the ceremonies thereof, and spit at them and did smite the priests, may well be compared with Pilates men, who (as we read in S. Matthew's

Gospel) bowing down their knees, mocked our Saviour Christ, spit at him and smote him upon the head."—*Sig.* Xii. *b.*

"But to return to our former purpose, concerning the wretched fruits that came of this doctrine, when altars were pulled down, and mass put away, then were all churches without any law, spoiled of all their ornaments, as of copes, vestments, altar clothes, corporaxes, chalices, crosses, candlesticks, censers, cruets, books, and all other things belonging thereto, and the same put to profane uses, as hangings of beds, curtains, cushions and other such like. And some men made jolly mocking and jesting, and called them the priests' masking clothes, as we told you before."—*Sig.* Y. iii. *b.*

"There was also," says Strype, "one MILES HOGHEARD or 'HUGGARD, a tradesman in Pudding-lane, who set forth a 'book about this time, (or rather the year after,) bearing for 'its title, *Against the english protestants*[9], a piece written 'with much bitterness and scurrility; laying to their charge 'the famine, and the other miseries of England. This man 'made some pretence to learning; but Bale laughs at him 'for going about to prove fasting from Virgil's Æneis and 'Tully's Tusculan questions. But he set himself to oppose 'and abuse the gospellers, being set on and encouraged by 'priests and massmongers, with whom he much consorted, 'and was sometimes with them at Bishop Bonner's house.[1] 'And the protestants were even with him, and made verses 'upon him, not sparing him at all: some whereof, in Latin, 'may be seen in Bale's Centuries. Against him wrote Laur, 'Humphrey, Crowley, Kethe, Plough, and others. When 'Mr. Hawks, a gentleman of Essex, was Bonner's prisoner, 'because he would not permit his child to be christened after 'the popish rites, this Hogheard was in company with Dr. 'Richard Smith, and others of the Bishop's chaplains, who 'came to confer with the said Hawks. Then did this trades-'man take upon him to talk with Hawks, but he was not his 'match. He asked Hawks, where in Scripture he proved

[9] I take it for granted that Strype had never seen the book. Its title is, "The displaying of the Protestants and sondry their Practises, with 'a description of divers their abuses of late frequented within their 'malignaunte church. Perused and set forte with thassent of authoritie, 'according to the order in that behalf appointed. Excusum Londini 'ædibus Roberti Caly Typographi Mense Junii 1556. Cum privilegio." 16mo.

[1] An odd way of expressing that a tradesman of Pudding-lane was received as a guest, and treated with familiarity and confidence by the Bishop of London.

'that infants were baptized, thinking thereby to drive him 'to acknowledge the authority of the Church. *But Hawks 'readily answered, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing 'them,' &c. To which Huggard replied, 'What, shall we go 'teach children?' Hawks again briskly, 'Doth that word 'trouble you? It might be left out full well.' [speaking 'ironically, as they would have it, to save themselves the 'pains of teaching.][2] 'It is too much for you to teach.' 'He added, 'Is not your name Huggard? and be you not a 'hosier, and dwell in Pudding-lane?' And when the other 'had confessed it, Hawks replied, 'It should seem so, for 'you can better skill to eat a pudding, and make a hose, 'than either to answer or oppose.' With which he was in 'a great rage, and did chafe up and down, whereat Hawks 'desired some good man to take the pains to walk the 'gentleman, he fretted so."[3]

We must remember that the "gentleman of Essex" is the reporter of his own performance, and taking him on his own ground, some may doubt whether he, or the hosier, had the best of it—if, indeed, Huggard was a hosier in Pudding-lane, for which fact I know of no other authority than that of the facetious "gentleman of Essex," who was perhaps only answered according to his folly. But whether or no, it is plain that Huggard was noticed by very leading men among his opponents, and it is worth our while to take a specimen of his book. I fear that too much of what follows is corroborated by what we have already extracted from the statements of writers on the other side.

"The ancient trade of this realm in education of youth, (before the late time replenished with all mischief,) was to yoke the same with the fear of God, in teaching the same to use prayer morning and evening, to be reverent in the church, at their first entrance into the same to make the sign of the cross in their foreheads, to make beysaunce to the magistrates, to discover their heads when they meet with men of ancient years, and of hoar hairs, according to Ovid's verses,

"'Age in time past, was had in great price
And to a hore head each child did arise.'
Fast. lib. v.

"But now clean contrary, nothing is less used than morning and evening prayer, more unreverence in the church never more fre-

[2] This is Strype's insertion in his quotation of Fox.
[3] Mem. III. i. 441.

quented, nor disobedience to magistrates and aged men at no time more practised. And as for repairing to the church, [it] is counted a thing of no importance. For how can the child put that in practice which the parents themselves neglect? The parents being infected with heresy, the child must follow the same, and must do as the young crab did, whereof we read a pretty tale in Æsop's Fables: who being commanded of his dame not to go so crooked, but to go more straight: 'O mother,' quoth he, 'go thou before, and I will follow.' In like manner, if the parents would walk more duly in their vocation and duty, the children would do the same. But as the fathers are, so are the children. The ill life and heretical trade of the parents maketh such unhappy and disobedient children, who in the end, unless they be looked unto in time, will be the father's bane. For the child, if his father be a catholic, will not be ashamed to say, he hath a papist to his father, or an old doting fool to his mother. A pitiful hearing, that heresy the regent of mischief should bear such rule without correction . . . Here also were worthy of remembrance the correction which ought to be done to apprentices and other servants, who being noselled in liberty are not only odious to the world, but also unthrifty towards their masters, and in manner become masters themselves. Whose bringing up is so lewd that they be grown to such insolence that no good man or priest passing by them in the streets can escape without mocks. But let their masters take heed, for I believe when they see their time they will mock them too in the end, hoping one day to have the spoil of their goods. Besides this their dissolute lives are such, that no regard they have at all to repair to the church upon the holydays, but flock in clusters upon stalls, either scorning the passers by, or with their testaments utter some wise stuff of their own dovise. So that prayer is seldom seen to proceed out of their graceless mouths."—p. 85.

But this paper has run to such a length, that I will only prolong it by one extract from BARLOW'S Dialogue[4]. The author is perhaps too well known to require any introduction, and how far his being known should lead to his being trusted, is a question which need not be here discussed. He is not cited as an authority, and whether his graphic sketch is in all points true or not, it is worth our attention.

"Mark it then substantially in cities and towns where ye see the people most rifest and most busy to prate of the gospel, whether they be or be not as great usurers, deceivers of their neighbours, blasphemous swearers, evil speakers, and given to all vices as deeply as ever they were. This I am sure of, and dare boldly affirm, that sith the time of this new contentious learning the dread of God is greatly quenched and charitable compassion sore abated.

"Shall ye not see there a cock-brained courtier, that hath no more

[4] The full title is, "A Dialoge describing the original ground of these Lutheran faccions, and many of their abuses. Compyled by Sir William Barlow chanon, late byshop of Bath. 1553."

faith than a Turk, and less Christian manners than a Pagan, with lordly countenance and knavish conditions, which taking the name of God in vain, shall unreverently alledge the gospel with scoffing and scorning in reprehension of the clergy: whereas his own lewd language is so unthrifty that ye cannot espie one good point in him, except it be upon his hosen, nor one inch of honesty beside his apparel, nor scantly there one neither, being all so hacked and jagged with double weapon ready to fight, and single wit busy to brawl and chide, more like a furious tormentor of Herod than a patient disciple of Christ.

"Shall ye not also see there a merchant peradventure made a gentleman by promotion ere ever that he had a good yeoman's conditions; which getting his chief substance, as many do there, by usury, false deceit of true people, and other wrongful ways, will take upon him to preach the gospel against the avarice of religious persons; how they, having their bare necessary food, ought to part the residue of their goods with poor people, whereas he himself hath thousands lying by him in store unoccupied, and will neither help his poor neighbour, nor scarcely give a galy halfpenny to a needy creature in extreme necessity.

"And at their belly-festing days, among such of their affinity which are not so wise nor well-learned as they would be seen, if it chance them to have in company some simple priest, it is a wonder to hear how he is apposed, and after that their spirits be a little kindled in gluttony, how they lash out the gospel. Then beginneth one or another with his potycarye formality, and holiday gravity, to move some subtle question, saying: 'Master parson, how say ye to such a text of Paul?' and if the priest be ignorant for lack of learning, or maketh not an answer satisfying his mind, he is mocked and jested upon with scornful derision. Then begin they to canvass the scripture among them with filling the cups, and jolly gentyl cheer, and by the time they have eaten more than enough, and have drunken too much, they be ready to wade forth in the deep mysteries of scripture, willing to be teachers of things whereof they understand not what they speak, nor what they affirm. Then are they full-armed to talk of abstinence and sober diet of the apostles, their table being furnished with sumptuous dishes and exquisite dainties; and whereas their cupboards be really garnished with costly plate, and the tables full of cups and pieces of silver and gold, then make they exclamations against the rich jewels of churches, as crosses and chalices, saying that better it were to make money of them and to be distributed unto poor people than they should perish for lack of succour. Likewise, when they be served at their solemnities with counterfeited courtesies and bowing the knee, and vailing the bonnet, having sewers and carvers after a most stately manner of service, wherein if the officers fail never so little, though it be but the setting of a saucer amiss they shall be rebuked, yet their pettish patience cannot break the honest ceremonies of the church to be laudably done, calling them foolish fantasies, and inventions of ideots. And though some of these new gospellers occupy truly and justly with their neighbours in the face of the world behaving themselves charitably, yet are they very

few in comparison of the other which be railers and jesters, vicious livers and false hypocrites, without any conscience."—*Sig.* L. ii. b.

These extracts, I repeat, are not given as authorities, and the reader must deduct what he thinks fit on the score of party and prejudice; the object is to illustrate the history and the spirit of the period, and in order to this we must hear both sides patiently, and become familiar with what is wrong as well as what is right.

ESSAY XV.

BISHOP GARDINER AND THE KING.

THE will of Henry VIII., under which Somerset and his colleagues took the reins of government, has been suspected of being a forgery. Whether it was, or was not, it is certain that it did not contain the name of Gardiner, who might have been expected to be one of the persons in whose hands the king would place the responsibility of government; and it is equally certain that, whether that omission was made by actually fabricating a will, or by the king (either spontaneously or through persuasion or management), or by any other means, it was highly agreeable to the Somerset party. Gardiner, however far he might have gone in the way of Reformation, was, after all, an "unclubbable man," who would not go heartily into the measures which they intended to pursue, and they did not wish to be troubled with him. Perhaps it would be plainer and truer to say, they meant to put him down.

But let us look at the history of the matter so far as it is recorded; and, in the first place, at the reasons popularly assigned for this omission. It is said that at the time of Henry VIII.'s death, and long before, Gardiner was out of favour with the king. If we look at the testimony on which Gardiner was deposed from his See, we find the Lord Paget stating that the bishop was "the man at that time 'whom the said Lord Paget believeth his majesty *abhorred* '*more than any man in his realm:* which he declared 'grievously at sundry times, to the said lord against the

'said bishop; ever naming him with such terms as the said 'Lord Paget is sorry to name. And the said Lord Paget 'thinketh that divers of the gentlemen of the privy 'chamber are able to depose the same."[1] On the same occasion, the Earl of Wiltshire said that he had "heard the 'late king of famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, 'declare his misliking of the said Bishop of Winchester 'sundry times."[2] The Lord Riche, too, "saith that he hath 'heard divers times of sundry persons, whose names he 'remembereth not, that King Henry the Eighth did think 'the said bishop not to be well pleased with the proceedings 'of the realm in matters of religion; and therefore this 'deponent hath heard say, that the said late king did 'mislike the said bishop."[3] If that were the case, one would think there should not be much doubt about the matter; for Henry was not usually ambiguous in his conduct to a disgraced favourite. He was one "who," as Burnet says, "never hated nor ruined any body by halves."[4] But when and why was the king displeased with Bishop Gardiner?

The earliest reason that I find assigned is his conduct in "the persecution at Windsor," under the Six Articles, in the year 1543. Even Fox distinctly states, that up to that time Gardiner was in high favour and power. Indeed, he begins his account of the Windsor business by saying, "When the 'time drew nigh that the king's majesty (who was newly 'married to that good and virtuous lady, Katherine Parr) 'should make his progress abroad, the aforesaid Stephen 'Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, had so compassed his matters, that *no man bare so great a swinge about the king as he did.*"[5] This is very plain and very important information; and it would be much more so if it came from a writer who could be better depended on; but such as it is, we must take it with us in our inquiry.

I do not indeed see why the origination of the Windsor persecution is attributed to Gardiner in particular, rather

[1] Fox, vol. vi. p. 164. [2] Ibid. p. 173.

[3] Ibid. p. 176. The depositions of the Earl of Bedford, p. 181, and Sir Ed. Carne, p. 185, may be consulted, but are not worth quoting, except for the fact that the latter, of all men, said that he could not depose to the fact.

[4] Hist. of Ref. i. 331. [5] Fox, vol. v. p. 486.

than to the rest of the council. They were informed that Anthony Peerson was preaching strange doctrine and distributing unlawful books in that town, and sent an order for a search. Forbidden books were found, and the issue of the inquiry thus originated, was that Peerson, with three others, named Testwood, Filmer, and Marbeck, were condemned to be burned. Gardiner went to the king and begged the life of one, and the other three were executed. Fox tells us, that the king riding one day in Guildford Park, and "seeing the Sheriff with Sir Humfrey Foster sitting on 'their horsebacks together, he called unto them, and asked 'of them how his laws were executed at Windsor. Then 'they, beseeching his grace of pardon, told him plainly, that 'in all their lives they never sat on matter under his grace's 'authority that went so much against their consciences as 'the death of these men did; and up and told his grace so 'pitiful a tale of the casting away of these poor men, that 'the king, turning his horse's head to depart from them, 'said, 'Alas! poor innocents.' After this," adds the historian, "the king withdrew his favour from the Bishop of Winchester."[6] This is rather too strong even for Strype, who dilutes it into, "observing how Winchester was the great agent in all this, never liked him after."[7]

Another cause assigned for the king's dislike of Gardiner is, the suspicion of his fidelity, which arose out of the affair of Germain Gardiner, the bishop's secretary, who was convicted and executed as a traitor, for his practices with the court of Rome. "Germain Gardiner," says Strype, "was, a year after" [that is, in 1544] "hanged, drawn, and 'quartered, as a traitor, for denying the king's supremacy. 'And the Bishop of Winchester, after this, never had favour 'or regard of the king more."[8] This is of course slaying the slain, for he had told us the year before that the king "never liked him after" the matter of Windsor. But here he outruns his usual authority Fox, who gives the story in a manner somewhat different. He says—"Upon the detec-'tion of this Germain Gardiner, being secretary to Gardiner, 'Bishop of Winchester, his kinsman, it seemed to some, and 'so was also insinuated unto the king, not to be unlike, but 'that the said Germain neither would nor durst ever

[6] Fox, vol. v. p. 496. [7] Cran. i. 158.
[8] Cran. i. 176.

'attempt any such matter of popery without some setting 'on or consent of the bishop, he being so near unto him, 'and to all his secrets, as he was. Whereby the king *began* 'somewhat more to smell and misdoubt the doings of the 'bishop; but yet the bishop so covertly and clearly con-'veyed his matters, playing under the board, after his 'wonted fetches, in such sort that (I cannot tell how) *he* '*still kept in with the king*, to the great inquietation of the 'public state of the realm, and especially of Christ's 'church."[9] It is curious to see how quietly, and I am quite willing to add unconsciously, some writers contradict themselves, and how easily their self-contradictions pass off with their readers, if only a few pages intervene; but when the passages are placed in juxtaposition, and one tries to imagine the facts, what a puzzle they make. As to mere matter of fact, was Gardiner in favour, or was he not? was the court of Henry the Eighth a place where great men could long be in doubt themselves, or deceive others on that point?

Following the order of time, we ought here to notice a fact which goes far to prove that all the foregoing pretence of the king's mislike of the bishop is false. As late as the year 1545, Gardiner was ambassador to the Emperor. Bishop Burnet tells us that "Cranmer had, at this time, 'almost prevailed with the king to make some further steps 'in a reformation. But Gardiner, who was then ambas-'sador in the emperor's court, being advertised of it, wrote 'to the king, that the emperor would certainly join with 'France against him, if he made any further innovation in 'religion. This diverted the king from it."[10] This was doing a good deal for a man misliked and mistrusted—for one who had been proved to be a false knave, and had got very near to be thought so. The Bishop of Norwich, too, deposed that "after this deponent was sent ambassador in 'residence to the Emperor, the said Bishop of Winchester 'was sent over with commission, in which this deponent and 'Sir Edward Carne" [who, as I have already stated, was afterwards unable to speak particularly to the point which we have in hand] "were joined," to treat with the Emperor and the French ambassador, "wherein the said bishop was

[9] Fox, vol. v. p. 526.

[10] Hist. of Ref. vol. i. 317.

the chief doer, and chief in estimation."[1] Another proof that the bishop was employed in public business transpires incidentally in a letter which he wrote to the Protector, after the king's death. It is dated, "At the Fleet, the 14th of October," 1547. "In which matter," he says, "I 'was very much troubled, even this time twelvemonth, when 'I was in commission with my Lord Great Master and the 'Earl of Southampton, for altering the Court of Augmenta-'tions."[2] So that at least as late as October, 1546, Gardiner was occupying a place of credit and confidence. Whether that was a little before, or a little after, the circumstances which I proceed to state I do not know, and it is not material; but I suppose what here follows to be the more recent of the two.

The third occurrence which is said to have alienated the king from Gardiner, is one which, even supposing it had that effect, contains unanswerable evidence that up to the time when it occurred, the bishop must have enjoyed, in a high degree, the royal favour and confidence. Indeed, the story, as it is popularly told, is one of those which pass current without any strict examination, and are rendered more and more probable by being (perhaps I ought to say, instinctively) smoothed and softened in some small degree by each writer, as he repeats them. Perhaps every man who really believes a story which contains some improbabilities, is liable to soften it in the relation, not merely as an apology for his own belief, or to conciliate the belief of others, but because the little matters dropped, or the explanatory suggestions inserted, have been put out, or put in, during the process of his own reception of the story; so that the story really exists in his mind in the modified form in which he hands it over to the next relater, that he may take his turn at probableizing, and pass it on. Such writers are not to be charged with anything like intentional falsehood; but that they are in fact the cause of much misconception, and mistake of facts, and therefore of all the false reasoning and false philosophy that is built on such false imaginations, is

[1] Fox, vol. vi. p. 190. This the Bishop of Norwich deposed, in answer to the IVth article. It is curious that in Sir Edward Carne's deposition that article is entirely passed over, (p. 185,) and indeed he does not seem to have been examined upon it. See p. 136.

[2] Fox, vol. vi. p. 44.

beyond all doubt. It is only by tracing stories back that we can judge how far they have been subjected to this process. The reader, who for the first time meets with an anecdote in its hundredth edition, and its most mitigated and swallowable form, may very naturally receive it in simple good faith, without the least idea that if he were to strip it down to its foundation facts and authorities, it would show itself to be an incredible and monstrous lie.

The story, however, with which we are concerned at present, as forming the third reason why Bishop Gardiner was abhorred by Henry VIII., and which may be found in Fox[3], is, as to its facts, (if they are facts,) pretty much as follows:—At the time of the king's last illness, Queen Katherine Parr was, and indeed from the time of her marriage had been, a decided favourer of the Reformation. This, of course, excited the jealousy, and fear, and malice, of the Popish party in general, and of Gardiner in particular; and it was determined to get her put to death. She had been in the habit of arguing with the king on religious subjects, and he had taken it well, "until, at the 'last, by reason of his sore leg, (the anguish whereof began 'more and more to increase,) he waxed sickly, and there-'withal froward and difficult to be pleased." He had left off his custom of going to visit her, and she used from time to time, either being sent for, or having found that it would be agreeable, to go to see him. On one occasion of this kind, we are told, she found Gardiner, who though disgraced and abhorred (or, to say the very least, mistrusted and disliked), seems, nevertheless, to have been either so much at home in his royal master's chamber, or else under such orders from him, that he outstaid her Majesty. "At this visitation," says Fox, "*chanced* the Bishop of Winchester aforenamed to be present, and also at the queen's taking her leave."[4] She seems to have been urging the king "zealously to proceed in the reformation of the church," and to have been startled at his somewhat testily changing the conversation. But he showed her no sign of anger; and, "after other pleasant talk, she for that time took her

[3] Vol. v. p. 533.

[4] No doubt it was a mere matter of chance who was in the king's chamber, the companion of the froward patient in his anguish, at the time when his royal consort came to visit him.

'leave of his Majesty; who, after his manner, bidding her
''Farewell, sweetheart,' (for that was his usual term to the
'queen,) licensed her to depart."

As soon as the queen was gone, however, Henry gave vent to his impatience, and opened his mind to the *mistrusted* and *detested* bishop. "The king, immediately upon her departure 'from him, used these or like words," [one wonders who reported them.] "'A good hearing,' quoth he, 'it is when 'women become such clerks; and a thing much to my 'comfort, to come in mine old days to be taught by my 'wife.'"

It was, perhaps as strange that the king should say all this to the most "abhorred" of all his subjects, as it was that the "abhorred" should be in such a place at such a time to hear it; but how incomparably (may not one say, incredibly?) strange does it seem, that the disliked and mistrusted bishop should have had the boldness, especially at a time when the irritable king was already in anger, to enter on a long oration, wound up with a plain warning to his majesty, how perilous a matter it was "to cherish a serpent within his own bosom." Whatever we may think of Gardiner in other respects, we must (unless his enemies have belied him) give him credit for singular boldness and straightforward honesty. He might be (and no one is more convinced than I am that he actually was) most decidedly and fearfully wrong in being a papist—in believing many of the doctrines, and following many of the practices, of popery; but surely, if he knew that the queen was "bold (being, indeed, become very zealous toward the 'gospel, and the professors thereof) frankly to debate with 'the king touching religion, and therein flatly to discover 'herself; oftentimes, wishing, exhorting, and persuading the 'king, that as he had, to the glory of God, and his eternal 'fame, begun a good and a godly work in banishing that 'monstrous idol of Rome, so he would thoroughly perfect 'and finish the same, cleansing and purging his Church of 'England clean from the dregs thereof, wherein as yet 'remained great superstition,"—if he also knew that "besides the virtues of the mind, she was endued with very 'rare gifts of nature, as singular beauty, favour, and comely 'personage, being things wherein the king was greatly 'delighted: and so enjoyed she the king's favour, to the

'great likelihood of the setting at large of the gospel 'within this realm at that time,"—if, I say, he knew this, and feared and hated it, as he must have done, was it not a good honest step thus, in the presence of other courtiers, to denounce the queen to the king as a "serpent"? Imagine a disgraced favourite, standing up before a tyrant in anguish with a sore leg, and saying all this of his consort, who "so enjoyed his favour," that notwithstanding a momentary irritation, (and that concealed from herself,) he had not only left her head on her shoulders, but had "knit up all arguments with gentle words and loving countenance," and dismissed her, "after other pleasant talk," with "Farewell, sweetheart!"

Strange, however, as the whole of such a scene must have been, the effect, we are told, was, that on the spot the king gave a commandment, "with warrant, to certain of 'them,[5] made for that purpose, to consult together about 'the drawing of certain articles against the queen, wherein her life might be touched." Having obtained this warrant, it is said, the popish party used all means, good and bad, to obtain evidence against the queen; but, as they could "not upon the sudden, but by means, deal with her," they determined first to attack, on the ground of the Six Articles, "some of the ladies whom they knew to be great with her," and they selected Lady Herbert, Lady Lane, and Lady Tyrwit, all of her privy chamber. It was thought that in searching their coffers and closets, something might be found that would criminate the queen, whom they might then instantly seize and carry off in a barge by night to the Tower. The king "was forthwith made privy unto the 'device by Winchester and Wriothesly, and his consent 'thereto demanded; who, (belike to prove the bishop's 'malice, how far it would presume,) like a wise politic 'prince, was contented dissemblingly to give his consent, and 'to allow of every circumstance; knowing, notwithstanding, 'in the end, what he would do."

I find it somewhat difficult to imagine that a "wise, politic prince," (indeed, any but a fool or a madman,) and most especially such a man as Henry, should be so absurd

[5] That is, I presume, of "them of that sect there present." One would like to know who they were.

as to act thus. But if the king's conduct was strange, that of the queen was at least equally absurd. Though she had been "somewhat amazed" at the way in which the king took her discourse on the occasion already mentioned, yet she continued her "accustomed manner" of talking to his majesty on the subject, which so irritated him; and he wishing "to try out the uttermost of Winchester's fetches," suffered her to say what she pleased without contradiction. Just, however, before what Fox calls "Winchester's final date," the king disclosed the matter to one of his physicians, "either Dr. Wendy or else Owen, but rather Wendy, as is supposed;" at the same time "charging him withal, upon peril of his life, not to utter it to any creature living." Happily for the queen, the councillor who had charge of the bill of articles, drawn up on purpose that "her life might be touched," and signed with the king's own hand, carried it about him so negligently that it dropped from his bosom, and, being picked up by a godly person, was carried to the queen. Her majesty knowing probably that she was liable to be called to account for transgressions of the law which have not been particularly recorded, (though we know enough to account for her being in some alarm,) "fell incontinent into a great melancholy and agony, bewailing and taking on in such sort as was lamentable to see." The successor of Anne Boleyn might well have trembled, even if she had known herself to be perfectly innocent.

However, the king hearing of her illness, sent his physicians, and among the rest Dr. Wendy; who of course understood the case better than any of the others, and who could not, though at the peril of his life, refrain from letting his patient know something of the secret which had been confided to him. His prescription was, "somewhat 'to frame and conform herself unto the king's mind, 'saying, he did not doubt but if she would do so, and show 'her humble submission unto him, she would find him 'gracious and favourable unto her." The king having soon after visited her, and behaved with kindness, the queen determined to follow Dr. Wendy's advice. She resolved to return his majesty's visit; having first, with more prudence than she had shown in her previous conduct, taken one very proper precaution:—"the queen remembering with 'herself the words that Master Wendy had said unto her,

'devised how, by some good opportunity, she might repair 'to the king's presence. And so, *first commanding her* '*ladies to convey away their books which were against the* '*law*, the next night following, after supper, she (waited 'upon only by the Lady Herbert her sister, and the Lady 'Lane, who carried the candle before her) went unto the 'king's bedchamber, whom she found sitting and talking 'with certain gentlemen of his chamber." He welcomed her very courteously, and proceeding "to enter into talk of religion," she lost no time in making a full abjuration, and humble apology, and assuring his majesty that if she had ever appeared to differ from him it had been not so much to maintain opinion, as to pass away the time of his majesty's sickness, and to gain some instruction from his majesty's learned discourse; "wherein," she added, "I assure your majesty I have not missed any part of my desire."[6]

This dissimulation and flattery, was, we are told (somewhat inconsistently as it regards the historian), successful. It seems as if the instinct to which I have already alluded, and by which people not only modify, but alternately, as it were, believe and disbelieve the incredible stories which they tell, had led Fox into very absurd self-contradiction. He has told us repeatedly, and is at pains to keep in our minds, that the king never meant to hurt the queen. If he gave her enemies directions to draw articles "wherein her life might be touched" it was "to see belike what they would do"—if he pretended acquiescence, it was "belike to prove the bishop's malice how far it would presume"—the king only wanted "to try out the uttermost of Winchester's fetches." All this, however, and all its meaning, the reader must forget before he comes to Fox's glorying over the politic submission of the queen, which wrought such a wonderful change in his majesty's feelings, "Now then, 'God be thanked! the king's mind was *clean altered*, and he

[6] Every reader of what Fox calls in his margin "The Queen's politic submission to the King" must hope that the unhappy woman did not disgrace herself by the false and fulsome oration which he has put in her mouth. But I trust the reader bears in mind that I am not relating what I believe to be true, but only telling a tale as it is told to me, in the hope that by the discussion of it truth may be elicited. With this view we must, in the first instance, take it as it stands.

'detested in his heart (as afterwards he plainly showed) 'this tragical practice of those cruel Caiaphases," who, however, knowing nothing "of the king's *well-reformed* mind," were intending to have carried the queen to the Tower the very next day.

On the afternoon of that morrow, and just as the appointed hour drew on, the king went to walk in the garden, and sent for the queen, who came attended by the three ladies whose arrest was to have been the prelude to her own. Happily, however, for them, though the unlawful books were hidden, that part of the plan had been abandoned. But there they were, taking the air with the king and queen, and two gentlemen of the bedchamber, "when suddenly in the midst of their mirth[7], the hour 'determined being come, in cometh the lord chancellor into 'the garden with forty of the king's guards at his heels, 'with purpose indeed to have taken the queen, together 'with the three ladies aforesaid, whom they had before 'purposed to apprehend alone, even then unto the Tower." The king, however, had a little private conversation with his chancellor, of which the only words recorded are, "knave, yea, arrant knave, beast, and fool;" and then sent him about his business. The queen, in real or pretended ignorance of the nature of the chancellor's offence, pleaded for him; and as Fox says, "by God's only blessing," (perhaps impartial truth might have required him rather to say, by falsehood, flattery, and the influence which she had over the king's affections, if he had any,) she "happily for that time and ever, escaped the dangerous snares of her bloody and cruel enemies for the gospel's sake."

"One has, however," says a writer in the Biographia Britannica, "some reason to wonder, that when John Bale 'wrote his article of Queen Katherine Parre, in which he

[7] Imagine the *mirth* of such a party. The king with his sore leg, and the fullest conviction that either the queen by his side was a detestable heretic, or his chancellor who was coming to fetch her to gaol, a "knave, beast, and fool." The queen, intensely pondering Dr. Wendy's prescription, and every now and then involuntarily feeling whether her head was on her shoulders. Her ladies with consciences burdened by a load of unlawful books, and the broken Act of Six Articles. Surely anything like genuine mirth must have been limited to the two unmindful gentlemen of the bedchamber; but perhaps their innocent gambols diverted the others.

'celebrates her learning, piety, and zeal for true religion, at 'the time all parties were living, and when anything against 'the Bishop of Winchester would have been well received, 'he should say nothing of this iniquitous contrivance. '(Bale, Script. edit. 1548, 4to, fol. 238.) Nor is it less 'strange that when matter was sought much further back 'to charge him with, this should not be remembered in the 'proceedings at his deprivation under the succeeding reign." —*Art.* Gardiner, p. 2104.

These few plain and sensible words seem to me quite sufficient to settle one's opinion as to the truth of a story which has, beside these considerations, such very suspicious marks of falsehood and absurdity. If it had been true, would not John Bale, or the Lord Paget, have alluded to it? for no doubt they did sometimes speak truth to serve their purposes. Or if it was *at that time* a popular lie (even suppose it a known, contradicted, confuted lie), where would you have found two men more unscrupulous in using such a thing, or more particularly and personally hostile to Gardiner?

The reader will, however, bear in mind that, so far as the object of this particular essay is concerned, I am under no temptation to decide against the story. If it is false, it may add another to many cautions which those who read the works of party writers are sure to get in the course of their studies; but for our present inquiry it is just nothing at all. If, on the other hand, it is true, it shows (beside some other things which I may perhaps hereafter find occasion to notice) that up to a very late period of Henry's reign, Bishop Gardiner was about the person, and shared the confidence of his royal master, and was on very familiar terms with him. This, too, I hope to corroborate by other evidence of a different kind.

ESSAY XVI.

GARDINER AND PAGET.

THE facts already stated should probably lead us to doubt whether all that has been said of Bishop Gardiner's disgrace is to be believed; and the evidence furnished by those facts is confirmed, and carried forward to a still later date, by some documents which I will lay before the reader as soon as I have reminded him of certain things of which it is quite necessary that he should have a present recollection, in order that he may form a right judgment on the case. Some of these documents have been very often and familiarly referred to; but even those which have been quoted I have never seen given with that fulness, or in the juxtaposition, which is necessary in order to our deriving the information which they really offer.

It is not, I believe, doubted that from the time when Henry VIII. began to be incapable of interfering strenuously with public business—or, to say the least, from the time when it had become pretty clear that there was no chance of his ever calling to account those who used his name and power—the party of which the Earl of Hertford was the head determined to make way for themselves by getting rid of their opponents in a very summary and unceremonious manner.

It is very well to say that the infirm king was jealous of the Howards, and fearful of their giving disturbance to his son, for it is likely that he should think of this; and it is tolerably certain that, if it did not occur to him, the notion would be brought before him, and forced on him, by some persons who undoubtedly did fear the Duke of Norfolk and his family; and who, whatever they might think about young King Edward, thought much more, and more intensely and affectionately, about themselves. The arrest of the Duke of Norfolk and his son was a bold (under other circumstances than those of the king, one would have said a desperate) stroke. The party succeeded, however, so far

as to kill the son; but, though far from slack in their proceedings, they were not quick enough by a few hours to destroy the father. The old Duke of Norfolk was saved by the king's dying on the very morning when he was to have been executed; but he was a prisoner, convicted, condemned, and attainted, who might be safely kept in the Tower; and there he was kept during all Edward's reign.

But before that time—while King Henry was yet living, though probably without his privity—the plan of the future government had been settled; and the two persons whom we find so early, and most deeply, concerned in these arrangements—the persons who, though in very different circumstances and positions, seem to be united together in an alliance capable of overruling all resistance, and even the attempt at any—are the Earl of Hertford and Sir William (afterwards to be Lord) Paget. Even before the king was actually dead, they were in consultation; and within a few hours after the royal demise, and before the event had been declared to the parliament—in fact while it was kept a secret even from the young Successor—these two men had the royal will in their custody, and were consulting together how much of it they should make public. One does not know how to speak of such things without asking the reader to pause a moment and consider. Will he endeavour to realize such a state of affairs as a mere matter of fact? for without some such effort it is impossible to understand the history of the period, even though one reads over what is so called a thousand times.

As to the Earl of Hertford—how he became Duke of Somerset and Protector—what he did and what became of him—every reader of English history knows, or easily may know; and it is not to our present purpose to inquire. But probably the history and character of his "inward friend and counsellor," Paget, is not so generally known; and a few particulars respecting him—as the chief, if not, indeed, the *original* and *only* voucher for King Henry's abhorrence of Gardiner—will not be out of place. I ought perhaps rather to say, will be absolutely necessary.

Sir William Paget, as I have already said, was the peculiar adviser and confidential agent of the Earl of Hertford.

This has been stated by Strype, in a passage which is worth extracting.

"While King Henry lay on his deathbed in his palace at Westminster, Sir Edward Seimour, Earl of Hertford, and Sir William Paget, among others, were at Court; and Paget, being Secretary of State, was much about his person: whom, being a man wise and learned, and well versed in the affairs of state, both by reason of his office and his several embassies abroad, the earl prudently made choice of for his inward friend and counsellor. By the king's desperate condition, the earl well perceiving the crown ready to fall upon Prince Edward his nephew's head, before the breath was out of his body, took a walk with Paget in the gallery; where he held some serious conference with him concerning the government. And immediately after the king was departed they met again, the earl devising with him concerning the high place he was to hold, being the next of kin to the young king. Paget at both meetings freely and at large gave him his advice for the safe managery of himself, and of the mighty trust likely to be reposed in him; and the earl then promised him to follow his counsels in all his proceedings more than any other man's. To his failure in which promises, the said Secretary attributed those miseries which afterwards befell the nation and himself; as he plainly told him in one of his letters."—*Mem.* vol. ii. pt. i. p. 17.

We are not, indeed, told how long before the king's death this walk in the gallery took place; but it is scarcely possible to doubt that what was thus settled with Paget, was understood and agreed to by the rest of the council. Mr. Tytler has given a letter from the Earl of Hertford to Paget, written within twenty-six hours after the king's death, in *reply* to one *already received* from that inward friend and counsellor, which contained suggestions as to whether the will should be opened before another consultation, and also as to the propriety of considering how much of the will it would be expedient to make public. In this reply the Earl expresses his concurrence in those suggestions, and adds as a brief postscript, "I have sent you the key of the will;" by which it appears that the keeping of that most important document lay with Hertford, and that he did not scruple to transfer the trust, without, so far as appears, any security, or even the privity of any third person, to the sole keeping of Paget.

On another letter, written the next day, to the Council —and that, too, before the fact of the king's death had been published—Mr. Tytler very justly observes, "When 'parliament and the nation yet believed Henry to be alive,

'the measures which were to be adopted under the new 'reign were already secretly agreed on by a faction to whom 'no resistance could be made. It is worthy of remark also, 'that Hertford, although still bearing no higher rank than 'one of the executors of the late king, is consulted by them 'as their superior, and already assumes the tone and 'authority of Protector, another proof that all had been 'privately arranged amongst them."[1]

We see something, then, of the position which Sir William (afterwards Lord) Paget occupied; and we may naturally be led to ask, "What sort of man was he?" His life seems to have been (as far as circumstances gave him opportunity) a tissue of ingratitude, treachery, and falsehood. At the time to which I have just referred, he was the creature of the Earl of Hertford, and he continued so as long as the sunshine lasted; but before the time when he gave his evidence at the deprivation of Bishop Gardiner, (to which I have before alluded, and which is indeed the matter which leads to our being concerned with him,) he had, with circumstances of peculiarly disgusting hypocrisy and treachery, betrayed his old master Somerset, and sold himself to his deadly enemy, the Earl of Warwick. And when this new master Warwick had wholly made away with that old master, and had set up Lady Jane Grey, the faithful Paget signed the declaration that he would stand by her; but the next day, a letter being written to the Lady Mary by the privy council, he was so obliging as to become the bearer of it, and left his new master to shift for himself—though perhaps I should say his old master—for he seems to have been under early obligations to Warwick, which preceded, in point of time, his devotion to Somerset. When, however, the Lady Mary had shown that she really was, and was to be, Queen of England, Paget seems to have forgotten all these old stories. One scarcely recognizes the "earnest gospeller," the partizan of Barnes the martyr, in the lively papist who received again in this reign the garter which had been stripped from him as a convicted and confessed scoundrel, and figured as Lord Privy Seal as long as that reign lasted. Elizabeth would have nothing to do with him.

[1] England under the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary, vol. i. p. 19.

Now, at the latter part of the reign of King Henry VIII., this same Sir William, or Lord, Paget was undoubtedly the bitter enemy of Gardiner—that is, he was one of the persons most fully determined to put Gardiner down, and prevent him from being troublesome. I am not aware that there is (nor do I know that we should look for) anything to account for this enmity beyond the plain facts that Paget was an unprincipled man, who had attached himself to the fortunes of the Earl of Hertford, and was driving on with all his might a cause which that leader wished to see carried, without, for his own part, particularly caring whether any man whom it might seem expedient to ruin had, or had not, been his own early friend and benefactor, and was or was not at the moment confiding in his good will and affection[2].

Thus much it seemed necessary to premise before I could properly lay before the reader some further evidence respecting the relative position of Bishop Gardiner and his royal master in the latter part of his reign. The facts stated in the preceding essay (if they are facts) must have belonged to a very late period of the king's life; but I do not know that their date can be accurately fixed. If we should ever find the Articles which were to touch the queen's life, and which the careless official dropped from his bosom, they may perhaps have dates. In the mean time we may go on with some documents which happily furnish us with those indispensable requisites for understanding history; and which require very little preface.

---

[2] Strype, after no very flattering account of Gardiner, adds, "Yet let 'me subjoin one or two things to his commendation: he affected learned 'domestics, and countenanced learning in his family: he would take in 'young university men, such as were of good parts & great hopes; several 'of these so entertained by him were afterwards Bishops, as White & 'Brokes, and two were Secretaries of State, and advanced to the honour 'of Barons, and employed by the state in great embassies. One of these 'was Sir William Paget, to whom Leland thus writ;

'Tu Gardineri petiisti tecta diserti,
'Eloquii sedem, Pieriique chori.

'That is, that being young, 'he went into learned Gardiner's family, 'which was the very seat of eloquence & of the muses.' From his family, 'as he had been of his college of Trinity Hall in Cambridge, so he went 'to study in the University of Paris. And after some stay, returned 'again into the bishop's house; and soon after became secretary of state." —*Mem.* III. i. 466.

It is enough to say that in the course of the proceedings for his deprivation in the year 1551, Gardiner put in a letter which he had formerly received from the king. The reader may remember that Henry died on the 28th January, 1547, and the letter is dated on the 2nd of December preceding. Having been thus made a part of the record of the proceedings of the commissioners for depriving Gardiner, that letter was preserved; and it was printed by Fox in the first edition of his Martyrology[3]. It was not a particularly interesting, perhaps not a very intelligible, document as it stood there by itself; but that was probably of very little consequence, partly because very few persons cared to read it, and partly because the few who did read it, knew that it was originally put in as evidence not to give information respecting the subject matter to which it referred, but simply to show the terms which the person who received it was on with the person who wrote it. Making, however, due allowance for the scarcity of the only book which contained it, we may say that the king's letter to Gardiner had thus been before the public more than two centuries and a half, when, in the year 1830, the government printed for the first time, from the stores of the State Paper Office, Gardiner's letter to the king, (to which that letter of the king given by Fox was an answer,) as well as a letter of Gardiner to Paget, requesting him to convey it to the king. The three letters thus singularly brought together after so long a separation are as follows:—

"CCLX. Gardyner to King Henry VIII.

"Pleasith it your most Excellent Majeste to pardonne me, that having noo such opportunite to make humble sute to your Highnes presence, as the trouble of my mynde enforcyth me, I am soo bolde to moleste your Majeste with thiese my letters which be oonly to desyre your Highnes, of your accustumed goodnesse and clemencie, to be my good and gratious Lorde, and to continue such opinion of me, as I have ever trusted, and, by manyfold benefites, certaynly knowen your Majeste to have had of me, and not to empayre it, as I

[3] It was, I believe, omitted in all others, until the comic Edition of Messrs. Seeley was published. In that the process has been reprinted—of course not very correctly, and therefore I quote the original edition, of which I happen to possess a portion sufficient for that purpose. But those who possess the more modern edition only, may find the passages which I quote by the figures in the margin of their own copies, vol. vi. p. 86, *et seq.*

veryly trust your Majeste wyl not, tyl your Highnes knowith, by myself, my dedes and bihavour to deserve the same, which I trust never to see your Majeste hath bounde noon other of your subgettes in, thenne me, and I have ever, and doo make thaccounpte of your Majestes benefites, soo as I esteme them worthely, asmoch as any other hath receyved, wherwith I have and doo rejoyse and counforte myself, with a mynde, desire, and entent in service, which is al of duetie, in sum parte, to declare myn inward rejoyse of your Highnes favour, and that I wold not wyllingly offende your Majestie, for noo wordly thing. This is my harte, afore God, and noo man hath harde me saye to the contrary; and if, for want of circumspection, my doinges or saynges be otherwise taken, in this matier of land, wherein I was spoken with, I must and wyl lamente myn infelicite, and most humbly, on my knees, desire your Majestie to pardon it. I never said naye to any request made, wherwith to resiste your Highnes pleasour, but oonly, in most humble wise, toke upon me to be a suter to your Highnes goodnes, wherunto I have ben bolded by thaboundaunce of your Majestes favour, heretofore shewed unto me. Your Highnes hath made me, without my desertes; and though I deserve not the continuance of that favour, yet I wold gladly, by humble prayour and intercession, supplie my want, if I coulde, to have such help at your Highnes handes, as I knowe others to have had, to be entertaigned for reputacion, whenne ther service hath fayled; wherin I have had as gratious answer from your Majestie, as I coulde wishe, for the which I most humbly thanke your Highnes. And yet, bicause I have noo accesse to your Majestie, ne hearing of late any more of this matier, I cannot forbere to open truly my harte to your Highnes, with most humble request to take the same in most gratious parte, for whose most prosperous felicite I shal, according to my duetie, praye duryng my life. At London, the seconde of Decembre.

"Your Majestes most humble
"and obedient Subget, Servaunt,
"and dayly Bedeman,
(Signed) "STE: WINTON.

(Superscribed)
"To the Kinges most Excellent Majestie."

"CCLXI. Gardyner to Paget.

"Master Secretary, after my right harty commendacions. I trusted to have seen youe here, or this tyme, and to have knowen by youe the Kinges Majestes pleasour; but your letters may be diverse, and therfor, as I thought to have wryten by youe to the Kinges Majeste at your beinge here, soo not hearing from youe, I have thought requisite to wryte to his Majeste, to supplie my present sute to his Person, which I wold gladly make, if it might stand with his pleasour. In the meane tyme, I praye youe deliver my letters, and also knowe, whither I maye cumme myself; which I have forborn, bycause I have been here appointed for execution of a commission, wherunto I attende, as the tyme requireth; and of the rest, such as came nowe to the Courte, wer specially sent for.

"I here no specialte of the Kinges Majestes myscontentement in this matier of landes, but confusely, that my doinges shuld not be wel taken; whirof I am sory, if it soo be, and al other cares set aparte, care oonly for this, that it shuld be thought I wanted discretion, to neglecte the Kinges Majestes goodnes towardes me, which, as ye knowe, I have evor estemed oonly, and therupon made my worldly foundation. Nihil ambio, nisi Principis gratissimi benevolentiam, ne videar ingratus, a quo crimine semper longissime abfuit animus. Wherin to the rest of the worlde, I knowe myself purged, quo nomine me duco infelicissimum, ut ingratitudinis nomine veniam in suspitionem Principi de me optime merito. I praye youe send me sum worde. And so fare ye hartely wel. At Southwark, the 2d of Decembre.

"Your assured loving Frend,

"(Superscribed) (Signed) STE. WINTON.

"To the Right Worshipful Sir William Paget Knight,
oon of the Kinges two Principal Secretaryes."[4]

"☞ *The Coppie of a letter, sente from Kyng Henry the eyght to the Byshop of Winchester.*

"Right reuerend Father in God, ryght trustye and wel-beloued, we grete you wel. Understandyng by youre letters of the seconde of this instante youre mynde touchyng suche matter as hath lately on our behalfe bene opened vnto you by certayne of our counsell, we haue thought good for aunswere, to signifye, that yf your doynges heretofore in this matter had bene agreeable to such fayre woordes as ye haue nowe written, neyther you should haue had cause to wryte this excuse, nor we anye occasion to aunswere the same. And we cannot but maruayle of this part of youre letters, that you neuer sayd nay to any request made vnto you for those landes: considering, that being this matter propounded, and at good length debated with you aswel by our *Chauncelor* and *Secretorye*, as also the Chauncelor of our Court of Augmentacions, both ioyntly and aparte, you utterly refused to growe to any conformity in the same, sayeing, that you would make your answere to our owne persone: which as we can be well contented to receive, and will not deny you audience at any mete tyme, when you shall make suite to be harde for your said answer, so we muste in the meane thinke that if the remembraunce of our benefytes towardes you, had earnestly remayned in your harte in dede, as you haue now touched the same in wordes, you would not have ben so precise in such a matter, wherein a great nomber of our subiects, and emongst others

[4] Part II. p. 883, of "State Papers published under the authority of his Majesty's commission, Vol. I., King Henry the VIII., Parts I. and II., 1830." A note on the Bishop's letter says, "This letter is holograph, and a contemporary indorsement fixes its date to 1546." Another note says, "The tenth instrument signed by stamp in December, 1546, is a letter to the Bishop of Winchester in answer to his letter to the king concerning an exchange of land desired by the king"—that is, the letter here given above from Fox.

many of your owne cote (although they haue not had so good cause as you) haue yet without indenting delte both more louingly, and more frendly with vs. And as touching you, our opinion was, that if our request had ben for a free surrender, as it was for an exchaunge only, your duty had ben to haue done otherwise in this matter then you haue: wherin if you be yet disposed to show that conformity you write of, we se no cause why you shoulde molest vs any further therewith, being the same of such sorte, as may well enough be passed without[5] officers there.

"Yeuen vnder our signet at our maner of Otelands, the iiii. of December the xxxviii yere of our reigne."[6]

These letters, perhaps, taking them all together, are not very intelligible as to their subject-matter. It only appears, and that (to use the bishop's phrase) somewhat "confusely," that an application had been made to him on the part of the king for an exchange of land, and that, by some hesitation, he had given, or was said to have given, offence to his majesty; but it is absolutely impossible to avoid gathering from the documents two things most important to our inquiry.

First—that if Gardiner really was, and for years had been, a cast-off courtier, hated and abhorred, the fact was very imperfectly known, or very oddly appreciated and dealt with, by the parties interested in it, and most likely to know all about it. Gardiner certainly does not write as if he thought it of himself; the king, (if we suppose the letter to have really come from him,) though secluded by illness so that none then came to the court but such as were "specially sent for," has no hesitation in granting him an audience in answer to his independent claim to make answer to his "owne person"—or if we suppose the letter to have been written by the Council without the knowledge of the king, and even by those who wished and intended to bring Gardiner into trouble, it is equally worthy of notice that they did not venture to represent his majesty as adopting the style of one who so hated and abhorred his correspondent.

Secondly, it is obvious (and it adds greatly to the force of what has been already said) that up to that time "wily Winchester," as the puritan party loved to call him, was simple enough to believe that his old pupil Paget was his friend. He evidently had full confidence in the viper whom

[5] So it stands; perhaps it should be "with our."
[6] Fox. First Edition, p. 801.

he had cherished in his bosom, when he wrote this letter to him.

Of this misplaced confidence indeed we have other evidence, which shows that it continued even after the accession of King Edward. Mr. Tytler gives us a letter which, as he says, "introduces to us the celebrated Gardiner bishop of 'Winchester, in a collision which took place a week after 'Henry's death, between the prelate and my Lord of Ox-'ford's players;" who had "advertised an entertainment in 'the Borough of Southwark, at the very time, it seems, that 'Gardiner and his parishioners resolved to have a dirige, or 'dirge, for his departed master;"[7] that is, on the first Sunday after the fact of the king's death was known. The letter is curious; but our only business with it is to observe that the bishop, not being able to make anything of the justice of the peace to whom he had applied, wrote an account of the matter to Master Secretary Paget, in a familiar, and even playful, style, adding, "If ye will not, *propter invidiam*, meddle, send me so word, and I will myself sue to my Lord Protector," and subscribing himself "your assured loving friend."

But in less than a month the bishop appears to have begun to find out his mistake. We have not his letter to Paget which elicited the reply, dated March 2, which Mr. Tytler has published, and which plainly shows that by that time Mr. Secretary had begun to be saucy and show his teeth. It is as follows:—

"My Lord,—After my right hearty commendations. I thank you for your good advices in your letter, and trust you will think, whatsoever some bodies shall (for that they want some piece of their own wilfulness) unjustly and slanderously either conceive or report of me, that I neither mean nor do nip or snatch any person, nor that unwisely I would usurp a greater power upon me than I have indeed (which is not great,)—when that I could tempre myself from using of all that which I might have used, when time served me, with the favour and consent of him from whom all our powers were derived, provoked by him oftentimes to use it, (as he testified to divers,) and having his promise to be maintained in the same[8].

[7] "England under the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary," vol. i. p. 19.

[8] If the reader is conversant with the depositions made against Gardiner at the time of his deprivation, he will understand the insolence and impudence of this allusion. If not, it is better to let it pass for the present, than to deviate into an explanation which would occupy a good deal of room, and for which we may find a better opportunity.

"In his days that dead is, (God have his soul!) I never did that I might have done. I never loved extremes, I never hindered any man to him but notable malefactors, and yet not to the extremity. I have *borne much with divers men*, and caused divers men *to be borne withal;* and by the judgement of mine own conscience have deserved benevolentiam of all. If any man will bear to me malevolentiam without cause, God judge between him and me. For private respects, I will not do anything wherein the public cause may be hindered. And in public causes I will say and do, as I have done always since I have been in the place, according to my conscience, without lending the same either to life, honour, wife, children, lands, or goods[9]; and yet not with such a frowardness or wilfulness but that a good man or a better conscience may lead and rule me.

"I malign not bishops, but would that both they and all other were in such order as might be most to the glory of God and the benefit of this realm; and much less I malign your Lorship, but wish ye well; and if the estate of bishops is or shall be thought meet to be reformed, I wish either that you were no bishop, or that you could have such a pliable will as could well bear the reformation that should be thought meet for the quiet of the realm.

"Your Lordship shall have your commission in as ample manner as I have authority to make out the same, and in an ampler manner than you had it before; which I think you may execute now with less fear of danger than you have had cause hitherto to do. No man wisheth you better than I do, which is as well as to myself; if you wish me not like, you are in the wrong; and thus I take my leave of your Lordship. From Westminster this 2nd of March, 1546.

"Your Lordship's assured to command,

"W. PAGET."

Thus much, then, brings the history fairly into the reign of Edward VI., and to a period when the enemies of Gardiner felt themselves secure in power, and able to say and do what they pleased with him. But I have already quoted a very sensible remark of a writer in the Biographia Britannica, who, after expressing his surprise that Bale, in his memoir of Katherine Parr, had said nothing of the bishop's atrocious attempt on the life of that queen, adds—"Nor is 'it less strange that when matter was sought much further 'back to charge him with, *this* should not be remembered in 'the proceedings *at his deprivation* under the succeeding 'reign."[1] This observation is very just, and very important; and its only fault is that it does not go half far

[9] On this passage Mr. Tytler adds the following note, "Good set words these of Master Secretary Paget's, and yet in 1552 he was deprived of his office and fined 2000*l.* for peculation. Haywood, Life of Edward VI. Kennet, vol. ii. p. 319."

[1] See before, p. 248.

enough. It *is* strange, if any such thing ever happened, that it should have been unnoticed by his enemies at a time, and under circumstances, when there seemed to be every temptation to bring it forward, and press it against the obnoxious bishop. But is it not more strange—almost incredible, if the popular story is true—that in the proceedings for the deprivation of Bishop Gardiner no hint whatever was thrown out of his ever having lost the favour of the late king, or of his being put into or put out of his will, until he himself provoked it, by adopting a line of defence which no man in his senses could have thought of, unless he knew that he was on safe ground, and that what he stated was not only true but notorious? In the document which is entitled "A longe matter proposed by the Bishop of Winchester," and which he exhibited to the commissioners at Lambeth, at the fourth session, Jan. 8, 1551, are the following articles:—

"2. Item, that the sayd bishoppe being charged with manye and sondrye commaundements, to be by him executed, doone and obserued in oure late soueraygne Lordes time that dead is, was neuer found faulty nor any fault obiected and proued agaynste him, but hathe beene alwayes, and yet is a true, paynfull, and iuste seruaunte, and subiecte in that behalfe, and so commonlye had, accepted, taken, reputed and accompted amonges the best sorte, and wyth all sortes of Personnes of all degrees, beynge not hys aduersaryes nor ennemyes, *ponit vt supra.*

"3. Item, that the said bishop hathe bene alwaies hetherto, and yet is estemed, taken and reputed a manne iuste of promyse, duelye obseruynge the same, and hath not bene called or troubled heretofore by any maner of sute, or other vexatyon in any Courte of thys Realme, spirituall or Temporall for anye suche pretence or occasyon as is aforesayd, vntil the time he was sente to the Tower the morrow after he preached, before the Kings maiesty in hys manor or pallace called the Whitehal at Westminster, being the next day immediatly folowyng, and the laste daye of June which shall be full iii. yeres at the same day next comming, and thys was and is trew, publyque, notoryous, manifest and famous. *ponit vt supra.*

"4. Item, the sayd Byshop was in such reputacion and estimation of the counsellors of our late souereigne Lorde that dead is, as being one of his maiestyes pryuy counsel til his maiesties death, that he was by their good contentment vsed in counsayll to haue the speach in their name to the Embassadors of Scotlande, the french kinge, and the Emperoure, within xiiii. dayes or there about of the death of our late souereign Lord. *ponit vt supra.*"—Fox, p. 783, 1st Ed.

This "longe matter," as I have already said, was proposed by the bishop himself on the 8th of January, and it

seems to have been in order to meet it that, "Thinterogatories ministred by thoffice" were issued on the 20th of the same month. Two of them were as follows :—

"4. Item, whether you know or haue hard saye that the said late King expresly willed him the sayd B. no more to be of the priuy counsell with the kinges maiestye our soueraigne Lord that now is, and omitted and expresly refused to haue him named emonges other counsayllors in his testament, to be of the counsel as is aforesayd.

"5. Item, whether ye know or haue hard say, that the said Bishop being aforenamed as an executor in the testament of the sayd late King, was a litle before his death at his declaring of his last will put out by his highnes, and so by him refused to be any of his sayd executors: for what causes the sayd bishop was so put out, and what the said late kyng sayd of the sayd byshop at the same tyme."—Fox, 1st Ed., p. 793.

It was necessary that the Lord Paget should meet these Interrogatories. Let us see how he did it.

"The xi. Session vpon the matter of Gardiner bishop of Winchester in the house of the Lord Paget, without temple barre, before the foresaid commissioners iudicially sitting, T. Argall Notary being present the day aforesayd, that is, the. xxiii. of January.

"At which sayd time and place, M. Davy Clapham and Jhon Lewis promoters of the office, did product Sir William Paget of the order of the Garter Knight Lorde Paget, vpon the articles layd in by the office, whome they desired to be sworne and examined as a witnes, according to the lawe, the sayd Lord Paget declaring that *honourable personages being of dignity as he was*, ever by the lawes of this realme priuileaged not to be sworne in common forme, as other witnesses accustomely, did sweare. Promising neuertheles vpon his truth to God, his allegeance to our soueraigne Lord the Kinges maiesty, and vpon his fidelity, to testify the truth that he doth knowe in this behalf," &c.—Fox, p. 797.

Being thus secure from the formal sin of perjury, this honourable personage, being of dignity, as he was, made answer—

"To the fourth, and fifte, he aunswereth that he knoweth that the sayde late kynge of moste worthy memory mislyked the sayde byshop, euer the lenger the worse: And that in his conscience, if the sayde kyng had lyued any whyle lenger then he dyd, he would haue vsed extremytie against the sayde byshop, as farre forth as the law would haue borne his maiestie: thynkyng to haue iuste and sore matter of olde against the sayde byshop in store, not taken awaye by any pardon: and at dyuers tymes asked the sayde Lord Paget for a certaine wryting touchyng the sayd byshop, commaunding hym to keepe it, saue that he myght haue it when he

called for it. And touching the putting of the sayde bishop out of his testament, it is true that vpon sainte Stephans daye at night, four yeares now past, his maiesty hauing bene very sick and in some perill: after his recouery, furthwith called for the Duke of Somersets grace, for the Lorde priuie seale, for my Lorde of Warwicke, for the late M. of the horse, for maister Denny, for the maister of the horse that now is, and for the said Lord Paget, at that time his secretary: And then willed Maister Denny to fetch his testament: Who bringeth fourth firste a forme of a testament, which his maiesty liked not, after he hard sayinge, that was not it: but there was a nother of a later making, written with the hand of the lord Wriothsly being Secretary: which when Maister Denny had fetched, and he heard it, he seemed to maruaile that some were left out vnnamed in it, whome he sayd he ment to haue in, and some in, whome he ment to haue out: and so *bad the sayd lord Paget*, in the presence of the foresayd lordes, to put in some that were not named before, and *to put out the bishop of Winchesters name*, which was done. And then after his pleasure declared in soundrye thinges, which he caused to be altered and entred in the will, his maiestye came to the naming of counsellors assistantes to his exeeutors: Wherupon the sayd lord Paget and the others, beginning to name my Lord Marques of Northampton, my lord of Arundell, and the reast of the counsell, not before named as executors: When it came to the bishop of Winchester, he bad put him out, sayinge he was a wilfull man, and not mete to be aboute his son the kinges maiesty that now is: Whereupon we passed ouer to the bishop of Westminster, whome his maiestie, bad put out also saying, he was scholed (or such like term) by the bishoppe of Winchester. And so passinge vnto the rest, he admitted all of counsell without stoppe, sauinge one other man, at whom he made some stick. But neuertheless vpon our suites, relented: and so he was named as a counsellor. This all done, the sayd lord Paget redde ouer to his maistye what was written, and he came to the place of counsellors. Reading their names, he began to moue the kyng agayne for the B. of Winchester: and the reste then presente set foote in with him, and did ernestly sue to his maiesty for placing of the sayd bishop emonges the counsellors: but he would in no wise be intreated: saying, he marueled what we ment, and that all we knew him to be a wilful man: and bad vs be contented, for he should not be about his sonne, nor trouble his counsell any more. The sayd lorde Paget, and the other were in hand also for the B. of Westminster: but he woulde in no wise be intreated, alleaging only agaynst him, that he was of Winchesters schooling, or such a like terme."—Fox, 1st Ed., p. 815.

We may well suppose that Gardiner was startled by the cool impudence of this reply; but he was not daunted, and evidently determined to go the bottom of the subject which he had introduced, probably without expecting exactly such a result. Accordingly we find that there were in the Thirteenth Session, and on the 26th day of the same month, six

"Interrogatories ministered to the Lord Paget" in particular, by the bishop; three of which are as follows:—

"5. Item, Whether the sayd Lorde Paget incontinentlye vpon the attaintment of the late Duke of Northfolke, did not do a message from the kings maiesty to the said bishop, that he would be content, that maister Secretary Peter might haue the same hundreth pounde by yere of the sayde bishops graunt, that the sayde Duke had.

"6. Item, Whether after the sayd B. had aunswered himselfe to gratifye the kinges maiestye to be content therewith, the sayd Lord Paget made relation thereof, as is said, to the kings maiesty. Who answered, that he thanked the Bishop very hartelye for it, and that he mighte assure himselfe, the kinges maiesty was his very good Lord.

"7. Item, Whether the sayd Lord Paget knew the sayd Bishop to haue bene in the counsell within xiii. dayes of the kinges departure to be there mouth to mouth to common [commune] with the Ambassadours, or no."—Fox, p. 798, 1st. Ed.

Here I must beg the reader's attention to dates, and his excuse if I repeat them. The letters between the bishop and the king respecting the exchange of land which I have already given bear date respectively the 2nd and 4th of December. The Duke of Norfolk was arrested on the 12th of that month. "The bill of attainder was read for the first time on 'the 18th of January, and on the 19th and 20th it was read 'a second and third time. And so passed in the House of 'Lords: and was sent down to the Commons, who on the '24th sent it up also passed. On the 27th, the Lords were 'ordered to be in their robes, that the royal assent might be 'given to it; which the Lord Chancellor, with some others 'joined in commission, did give by virtue of the king's letters 'patent. And it had been executed the next morning, if 'the king's death had not prevented it."[2]

The reader will see that, strictly speaking, the attainder of the Duke of Norfolk had scarcely been completed during the life of Henry VIII., and therefore, that when Gardiner speaks of occurrences after that attainder, he is speaking of a period obviously later than any at which any quarrel or disgrace with the king could have taken place. Paget's assurance, however, did not fail him; he replied—

"To the v. and vi. articles, the sayd lord Paget answereth, that after thattainder of the Duke of Norfolke, (as he remembreth) in the vpper and nether house of the parliament, the late kyng of

[2] Burnet, Hist. of Reformation, i. 332.

moste worthy memorie, willed hym the sayde lorde Paget to require the sayde byshops graunt of the hundreth poundes, mentioned in the articles: but in suche sort his maiestie willed it to be requyred, as he loked for it rather of dutie, then of any gratuitie at the byshops hand: to whome the sayd lord Paget sayeth of certayne knowledge (as men may knowe thynges) he the sayde kyng woulde haue made request for nothyng, beyng the sayd byshop the man at that time, whome the sayde Lorde Paget beleueth, his maiestie abhorred more then any man in his realme: whiche he declared greuously at sondrie tymes to the sayde lorde against the said B. euer namyng him with such termes as the said lord Paget is sory to name. And the said lord Paget thynketh, that dyuerse of the gentlemen of the pryuie chamber are able to depose the same. Neuerthelesse *it may be*, that he the sayde lorde Paget, did vse another forme of request to the said B. then the said king wold haue lyked yf he had knowen it: which *if he dyd*, he dyd it rather for dexteritie, to obteigne the thyng for his frend then for that he had such speciall charge of the sayd kyng so to do: And also the sayde Lord Paget saith, that afterward *it myght be*, that he vsed such comfortable words of the kynges fauourable and thankefull acceptation of the thyng, at the sayde byshoppes hande, as in the article is mentioned: whiche *if he dyd*, it was rather for quyete of the sayde Byshoppe, then for that it was a thyng in dede.

"To the seuenth article, the sayd Lord Paget sayth, that it may be, that the sayd bishop was vsed at the time mentioned in the article, with the Ambassadours, for the counsels mouth, because that none other of the Counsell that sate aboue hym, were so well languaged as he, in the french tonge. But the sayde Lorde Paget beleueth, that if the sayde kyng that dead is, had knowen it, the Counsell would haue had litle thankes for their labour."—Fox, 1st Ed., p. 816.

The unfortunate bishop had clearly met with more than his match. What could he do with such a man but remind the Commissioners that in his case, as in that of some others who had not been sworn, "the sayde othe-geuing 'was not by speciall consent remitted, but especially and 'expressly by the parte of the sayd byshop requyred," and that therefore "their deposition by thecclesiastical lawes 'hath no such strength of testimonie, as the Judge should 'or might for the knowledge of truthe, haue regard to 'them." He added, however, and it seems to me to show both that he knew his enemy, and that he did not fear him:—

"The sayde byshop dare the more boldely alleage this exception; and so much the rather, that the Lord Paget hath in his deposition euidently, and manifestly neglected honor, fayth, and honestie, and sheweth hym selfe desirous beyond the necessarie aunswere, to that it was demaunded of him, (onely of ingrate malyce) to hyndre, as

muche as in him is, the sayd byshop, who was in the sayd Lordes youth, his teacher, and tutor: afterwarde his maister, and then his beneficiall maister, to obtayne of the kynges maiestie that dead is one of the roomes of the clerkshyp of the Signet for him: whiche ingrate malice of the sayd Lord Paget, the sayde byshop sayth in the depositions manifestly doth appeare, as the sayde byshop offereth hym selfe readie to proue and shewe. And moreouer the sayd byshop against the Lord Paget allegeth at such tyme, as the said Lord Paget was produced against the saide byshop, the same Lorde Paget openly in the presence of the iudges, and other there present, sayde howe the sayde byshop did flie from iustice, whiche made him notoriously suspected, not to be affected indifferently to the truthe (as semed him) and without cause therein to speake, as enemy to the sayde byshop."—Fox, 1st Ed., p. 864.

Much that is interesting might be added on this point, from the evidence in this process; but perhaps what has been given from it, and from other sources, may lead us to believe that Bishop Gardiner did not indulge in vain boasting, when, in his letter to the Protector Somerset, he referred with affectionate recollection to old times, and his old master, and boldly added, "NO MAN COULD DO ME HURT DURING HIS LIFE."[3]

ESSAY XVII.

GARDINER AND BONNER. No. I.

"DE VERA OBEDIENTIA."

EVERY one who has paid attention to the examinations of the reformers, as they are recorded by Fox in his Martyrology, must have observed how frequently they were characterized by a spirit of retort and recrimination which, though it might sometimes be very smart and clever, certainly was not more politic than it was Christian. It seems as if common sense might suggest that the *argumentum ad hominem* is not for one who stands at Cæsar's bar, and who is being tried, not by the man, but by the law. A prisoner who is indicted for stealing a horse, will not entitle himself to an acquittal by proving that the judge has stolen two. And, indeed, though he may be

[3] Fox, 1st Ed., p. 736.

sure of his proofs, and feel bound in conscience to publish them, yet, if he is a wise man, he will certainly, both for his own sake and for the purposes of justice, let the matter stand over till he has got out of the dock.

In the cases here alluded to, however, the pleasure of having a hit at a papist persecutor—especially a bishop—and most especially one of those two bishops who had provokingly come out of gaol, and reseated themselves in the chairs lately occupied by Ponet and Ridley—was so great, and the thing was so congenial with the mocking and jeering spirit of which too many popular writers and preachers of the party had set examples to their followers, that the temptation seems to have been irresistible. But after the specimens which I have given (considering, too, that for decency's sake I have passed over the worst) it is unnecessary here to offer any general reflections on this matter.[1]

One very favourite course of this kind was (if I may so misapply terms to carry on the figure which I have used) something like filing a cross bill against the Lord Chancellor himself. It was the taking the opportunity of being brought before him, to tell him to his face, that whatever his poor orator might be with regard to such matters of treason, sedition, or heresy, as he was charged with, his lordship himself with his great seal and mitre, and his pomp, and pride, and papistry, was an unprincipled turncoat, and a perjured rascal. A weathercock, too, they called him; though, if he was, he had certainly got rather rusty in the time of Edward.

---

[1] I need not remind the reader of the styles of Bale and Ponet; but as we are at present principally concerned with Bishop Gardiner, I am tempted to quote what he says with particular reference to Barnes, but with a more general application to the body to which he belonged. It is in the preface to "A Declaration of such true Articles as George Ioye hath gone about to confute as false," printed in 1546.

"Barnes whom I knewe fyrst at Cambridge, a trymme minion frere 'Augustine, one of a merye skoffynge witte frerelike, and as a good 'felowe in company was beloued of many, a doctour of diuinitie he was, 'but neuer like to haue proued to be either martyre or confessor in christes 'religion, and yet he began there to exercise raylinge (which amonge 'such as newely profess christ, is a great pece of conuynge, and a great 'forwardness to reputacion, speciallye if he rayle of Byshops as Barnes 'began, and to please suche of the lower sort as enuieth euer auctoritie) 'chefiye againste my lorde Cardinall, then, vnder the Kinges maiesty, 'hauing the high administracion of the realme."

And Bonner came in for his share in all this though he was as rusty as Gardiner; and, in particular, it was charged upon these two bishops, that in former times they had joined in making a book to deface the Pope, and set up the king's supremacy; and the taunt against them was, that now, with shameful (or rather shameless) inconsistency, they were setting up the Pope. Whether those who made this an offence meant that Gardiner and Bonner, having once maintained the supreme headship of King Henry, were bound to maintain that of Queen Mary, they did not clearly explain. The matter was done rather in the way of what Fox calls "privy nips"—sly hints and innuendoes—which were understood by those who were present, and which being, of course, wholly irrelevant, and obviously intended only to aggravate the judge and render him odious in the eyes of the assembly, were not dwelt upon, and therefore never (as far as I know) so fully explained as one could wish.

One word, however, I must say about these Examinations before I quote from them—namely, that I do not look upon them in quite the same light as I do upon reports of trials "taken in short-hand by Mr. Gurney." The accounts which we have are in many cases given by the parties themselves; and it is not impossible, or even unlikely, that some of the writers might be rather bolder, and wiser, and wittier,—and perhaps a little more moderate in invective, not to say less scurrilous—after reflection, and on paper, than they had been at the moment, and by word of mouth. In these cases, and also where we are simply indebted to the observation and memory of friends who were present, we must not forget that we are reading *ex parte* statements. Some of them, too, by persons who, giving them all credit for honesty of purpose, were not qualified to understand and report long discussions, not unfrequently relating to matters involving a good deal of abstruse and subtle disquisition. And it must be added, for it is a still more important consideration, that many of these documents passed through the hands of men who did not hesitate to give to the public what, in their opinion, *should have been* said, instead of what really *was* said, by the champions of their party.[2]

[2] The following extract from Strype's Life of Grindal will explain and

With the recollection of this fact, we must of course look on these reports with suspicion; but bearing it in mind, and considering that we have nothing better, we must take things as we find them, and run the risk of sometimes appearing inconsistent by being obliged, as the truth is developed, to abandon statements which have, in the first instance, been acquiesced in, because there did not seem to be sufficient evidence to contradict them.

A striking illustration of what I have been saying is offered to us in what may perhaps be considered as one of the first overt acts of Protestantism which led to severe punishment after the accession of Queen Mary. The reader will remember that she came to the throne in July, 1553, issued a proclamation against preaching in August, and was crowned on Sunday, the 1st of October. On the next Sunday but one "Master Laurence Saunders preached at 'Allhallows, Bread-street, in the morning; where he

---

attest this, and by those who really desire truth it should be most deeply pondered. The brackets are Strype's.

"Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, and Martyr, his Examinations also were soon come over from England. Which; when Fox had spoke 'somewhat concerning, and consulted with Grindal, Whether they ought 'not to have a review, and some Corrections of them made, before they 'were exposed to the Publick; Grindal freely thus exprest himself in this 'Matter, 'That there were some things in them that needed the File; 'that is, some prudent Hand to usher them out into the World. For, 'that Philpot seemed to have somewhat ensnared himself in some Words, 'not so well approved; as, That Christ is *Really* in the Supper, &c. And, 'That if the English Book had not been divulged, some Things might be 'mitigated in it. And next, That he sometimes cited the Ancients 'Memoriter, being void of the Help of Books; where one might easily 'slip; [as he did.] As when he said, That Athanasius was Chief of the 'Council of Nice; when as he at that Time was only the Deacon of the 'Bishop of Alexandria, as he [Fox] had remembred rightly. But Atha-'nasius, he said, laboured in Disputes more than the rest, and in that 'Sense, indeed, he might be said to be the Chief. But there the Contro-'versy was of Honour and Primacy. [And therefore Philpot could not 'be brought off by that Means.] Grindal also supposed, that Fox him-'self might in like Manner espy some other Oversights; wherefore he 'bad him use his Judgment. Grindal subjoined, that he had heard, that 'Peter Martyr and Bullinger had wished, that in the Writings of Bishop 'Hooper, he had had time and Leisure to recognize what he wrote. 'For being wrote suddenly, and under confinement he had not warily 'enough writ concerning the cause, that had been tossed about by his 'Disputations with so many, as such an envenomed Age required."—*Fol. Ed.*, p. 20.

'declared the abomination of the mass, with divers other 'matters, very notably and godly."[3] This led to his being brought before his diocesan Bonner, accused of treason, sedition, and heresy. The Bishop declined entering into any inquiry respecting the first two charges; but in reference to the third, examined him on the doctrine of the eucharist, and then let him go to the Lord Chancellor, (that is Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester) who was out when he arrived, but—

"At last the bishop returned from the court, whom as soon as he was entered, a great many suitors met and received: so that before he could get out of one house into another, half an hour was passed. At last he came into the chamber where Saunders was, and went through into another chamber: where, in the meanway, Saunders's leader gave him a writing, containing the cause, or rather the accusation, of the said Saunders; which when he had perused, 'Where is the man?' said the bishop. Then Saunders, being brought forth to the place of examination, first most lowly and meekly kneeled down, and made courtesy before the table where the bishop did sit; unto whom the bishop spake on this wise:

"'How happeneth it,' said he, 'that notwithstanding the queen's proclamation to the contrary, you have enterprised to preach?'

"Saunders denied not that he did preach; saying, that forsomuch as he saw the perilous times now at hand, he did but according as he was admonished, and warned by Ezekiel the prophet—exhort his flock and parishioners to persevere and stand stedfastly in the doctrine which they had learned: saying also, that he was moved and pricked forward thereunto by the place of the apostle, wherein he was commanded rather to obey God than man; and moreover, that nothing more moved or stirred him thereunto than his own conscience.

"'A goodly conscience, surely,' said the bishop. 'This your conscience could make our queen a bastard, or misbegotten: would it not, I pray you?'

"Then said Saunders, 'We,' said he, 'do not declare or say, that the queen is base, or misbegotten, neither go about any such matter. But for that, let them care whose writings are yet in the hands of men, witnessing the same, not without the great reproach and shame of the author:' privily taunting the bishop himself, who had before (to get the favour of Henry the Eighth) written and set forth in print a book of 'True Obedience,' wherein he had openly declared queen Mary to be a bastard. Now master Saunders, going forwards in his purpose, said, 'We do only profess and teach the sincerity and purity of the word; the which, albeit it be now forbidden us to preach with our mouths, yet notwithstanding, I do not doubt, but that our blood hereafter shall manifest the same.' The bishop, being in this sort prettily nipped and touched, said, 'Carry away

[3] Fox, vol. vi. p. 541.

this frenzy-fool to prison.' Unto whom master Saunders answered, that he did give God thanks, which had given him at last a place of rest and quietness, where he might pray for the bishop's conversion." —Fox, vol. vi. p. 616.

This the martyrologist calls in his margin, "A privy nip to Winchester;" and of course by the time when Fox wrote, it was merely a good joke. But if we consider the manners and feelings of the age, and endeavour to realize the idea of a priest accused of treason and sedition most lowly and meekly kneeling and making courtesy before the Lord Chancellor (to say nothing of the bishop), and then talking to him in this way, we shall not be surprised to find that he was treated as one out of his wits, and sent to prison. It may indeed surprise some of those whom (if I may without offence borrow a phrase from a passage which I am about to quote) I will call the "Foxie generation," to learn that Laurence Saunders was not instantly racked with insufferable torments, and then burned out of hand. But instead of this, for some cause or other, which, whatever it might be, seems inconsistent with a raging thirst for blood, he seems not to have been brought up again for examination, or rather, never to have been formally examined at all, until after an interval of about fifteen months.

The object, however, to which I wish more particularly to draw the reader's attention, is the book to which Saunders on this occasion referred, as written, and set forth in print, by Gardiner. There is a mystery about this book *De vera Obedientia* which I have not yet been able to fathom, and do not pretend to understand. There has been so little inquiry about the matter that I may perhaps be able to give some information; but I write also with a view of obtaining it, and with a consciousness that under such circumstances I am very likely to make mistakes. If I do, the correction of them will not only be a satisfaction and benefit to myself, but a contribution towards our knowledge of a portion of our ecclesiastical history which is peculiarly worthy of study, and which offers to the inquirer many little mysteries which even when they are not intrinsically worth investigation, yet frequently repay that trouble by throwing light on other matters of greater importance, and which have been supposed to be better understood than they really were.

Others have probably sympathized with Mr. Stevens, who

has lately reprinted this work of Bishop Gardiner; and who tells us, "the extract which Fox gives of this very scarce and 'extraordinary tract of Gardiner's, with its no less extra-'ordinary preface by Bonner, had often excited in our mind 'a great desire to see the originals, and that desire was 'considerably increased by the frequent appeal to it by 'almost all the reformers upon their examinations."[4] Yet it must be confessed, that no such curiosity seems to have induced the two most recent biographers of Gardiner and Bonner even to look at the title-page of the tract, or at least to get by heart its short and simple title "De vera Obedientia." The former writer tells us that Gardiner "not only acknowledged the King's supremacy, but wrote a book in defence of it, entitled, 'De verâ *et falsâ* Obedientia;'" the latter says, "Stephen Gardiner's famous book, *De Vera 'Differentia regiæ potestatis et Ecclesiasticæ*, was published 'in 1534 . . . . . it was reprinted in 1536, and a stringent 'preface was prefixed to it by Bonner."[5]

---

[4] Life of Bradford, App. p. lxi.

[5] Since this was published, a passage has been pointed out to me in Southey's Book of the Church, which I feel it right to notice on more than one account. He says of Laurence Saunders, whom I have just now mentioned, "In Edward's reign, he married, and obtained preferment; now when the persecution began, he was *soon selected as a victim*, and brought before Bonner, who had replaced Ridley in the see of London." (Vol. ii. p. 149.) It is almost impossible to imagine a more complete misrepresentation of the particular matter, or one more calculated to mislead the reader as to the general state of things. When Queen Mary came to the throne Saunders was holding the two livings of Church Langton in Leicestershire, and of Allhallows, Bread-street, in London. Fox tells us that when the troubles began he was in the country, only in order to discharge himself of his cure there; but that finding he could not resign either living into the hands of any but a papist he continued to hold both. This is most probably a charitable afterthought of the martyrologist to excuse the mention of his plurality, for (if Newcourt is correct) Saunders became Rector of Allhallows, Bread-street, in March, 1553, and one would think might have had time to resign, and have been in no doubt about finding a fit successor, before King Edward died in July. However, he was in fact doing the duty at his country living, when in the month of August the proclamation against preaching was issued. He set it at defiance and preached *on*; of course not unnoticed, though it does not appear how or by whom. Some of his friends counselled him to fly, but he refused to hear of it. On the contrary, "seeing he was with violence kept from doing good in that place, he returned towards London to visit the flock of which he had *there* the charge." The "violence" which Fox talks of was, I suppose, somewhat like the

Yet surely it must have struck both writers and readers as rather an odd thing, and one not altogether unworthy of

---

"rage" and "fury" which he so commonly ascribes to persons who appear to be acting and speaking very collectedly; for it seems to have left Saunders a free agent, and quite at liberty to pursue his way to London or anywhere else. And so what he was prevented from doing by violence at his living in the country, he resolved to do in London almost under the eye, and in the hearing of his ferocious diocesan. On the 14th of October, therefore, he drew nigh to London, and so doing he fell in with Sir John Mordant, one of the Queen's Council, who seems to have been acquainted with him, and who on learning his purpose urged him to desist. He would listen to no advice, and when they entered the city they parted. The Councillor, going to the Bishop, informed him of Saunders's intention; and Saunders, going to his lodging, told "one who was there about him," and who perceived that he was troubled, "In very deed I am in prison till I be in prison."

If, as I have said on Fox's authority, "Master Mordant, of an uncharitable mind, went to give warning to Bonner" on Saturday, it does not appear that the Bishop took any step until the next day, when the Rector of Allhallows, Bread-street, had preached the morning sermon, and "in the afternoon he was ready in his church to have given another exhortation to his people." Then he was sent for to the Bishop's palace, where he found Sir John Mordant with Bonner and his chaplains. It seems as if the Councillor had been present at the morning sermon, or, at least, as if he was the person who then and there preferred the formal charge respecting it. That charge, as Bonner explained to the preacher, comprehended treason, sedition, and heresy. Of the two former heads the bishop waived all consideration; not, I apprehend, as Fox represents it, "until *another* time," but as things with which he had nothing to do, and to which the prisoner must answer before another tribunal. In the mean time they had "*much* talk" about the ceremonies of the "church papistical," and how they were "partly blasphemous, partly unsavoury and unprofitable." And *after* that (as Southey quotes from Fox correctly enough, except that he represents it as if the Bishop had done it without a word of preface or reference to anything else) "Bonner desired 'him to write his opinion concerning transubstantiation: he obeyed 'without hesitation, saying, as he delivered the writing, 'My Lord, ye do 'seek my blood, and ye shall have it. I pray God that ye may be so 'baptized in it, that ye may thereafter loath bloodsucking, and become a 'better man.'" The reader will bear in mind that, at this time, no subject of Queen Mary had been put to death on the charge of heresy, nor do I know that such a thing was even threatened or talked of for a twelvemonth afterwards; and he will not be surprised to find that Bonner is not recorded to have made any answer. Fox says that the Bishop "sent Laurence Saunders to the Lord Chancellor;" and this may be allowed to pass; though I suppose it would be more correct to say that the Councillor took his prisoner there; for Fox tells us that, when they came to the Chancellor's, "Saunders stood very modestly and soberly at the screen or cupboard bareheaded, Sir John Mordant his guide or leader walking up and down by him." Then followed the scene which I have just given

inquiry. Familiar as we are with the united names of Gardiner and Bonner, and natural as it would seem to most modern readers to meet with them joined in an order to burn a heretic, one is not quite prepared to find them forming a sort of literary firm or partnership. Of course, we know that there have been such unions between distinguished writers at all times, from the days of Beaumont and Fletcher to those of Mant and D'Oyly; but in this case of Gardiner and Bonner, the relative position of the parties, and the division of labour, is so very strange. The Bishop of Winchester, both personally and officially one of the most eminent and powerful men in the kingdom, writes a little book on a political subject of the utmost delicacy and

---

above from Fox; and that issued as I have already stated in the prisoner's being treated simply as a rebellious fanatic, who could not be allowed to proceed in his work of agitation, and who was sent into confinement, where he lay, so far as appears untouched, if not actually forgotten, for a year and a quarter.

Is it not too much to represent this man, as one who "was soon selected as a victim?" Should it not make people cautious how they adopt historical statements from popular writers on party subjects, especially when for some reason or other they are writing about matters of which they are ignorant? I do not mean to charge Southey with intentional falsehood, but so little care did he take to be accurate in the superficial compilation which he presumed to call "The Book of the Church," that in telling this story he was absolutely not aware of the transfer of the prisoner from Bonner to Gardiner; and, after the words of Saunders which I have just quoted in this note, he goes on (supposing it to be all one conversation and repeating what the reader will find, in my quotation from Fox in the text just before, were *Gardiner's* words) "When he spoke of his conscience *Bonner* exclaimed, 'A goodly conscience truly,'" &c., and this makes it necessary for him to explain to the readers of "The Book of the Church," who could not be supposed to be prepared with so much learning as her champion, that "*Bonner* had, in 'Henry's reign, written and printed a book, wherein he declared the 'marriage with Catherine unlawful, and the Princess Mary illegitimate. 'This retort touched him, and he *immediately* said, 'Carry away this frenzy fool to prison.'"

The reader will see that (beside the blundering between the Bishop of London and the Lord Chancellor) there is here a gross falsification in representing the Chancellor as *immediately* giving a passionate order because he was touched by a personal retort. It does not appear that he took any notice whatever of the insult, or that anything was done to prevent the prisoner from "going forwards in his purpose," how long, or in what language, it might be hard to say, until he began to state how he and others would find a way of doing with their BLOOD what the state forbade them to do with their mouths.

highest importance. The Archdeacon of Leicester, a man of no particular personal importance, and comparatively of no consequence at all, issues a new edition of it, with a fulsome puffing preface of his own. To be sure it may be said that strange things of this sort have happened in modern times, and that in our own days popular writers have bestowed the same sort of prefatory patronage on eminent authors. But that I believe was generally supposed to be rather an affair of the Trade; and besides, it was not done in the lifetime of the authors, or to their faces, or while they were (for indeed they never were) among the greatest men in the church and state.

But if we can get over all this, there is one thing more, according to Fox, which is quite enough by itself to puzzle the matter. He declares that the archdeacon and the bishop (the puffer and the puffed) hated each other. He tells us in the plainest terms, that Bishop Gardiner continued to favour the reforming party, and was firm and forward in it, "so that who but Winchester during all the time and 'reign of Queen Anne. After her decease that time by 'little and little carried him away, till at length the 'emulation of Cromwell's estate, and especially (as it 'seemeth) for his so much favouring of Bonner, *whom* '*Winchester at that time in no case could abide*, made him an 'utter enemy both against him, and also his religion."[6] Fox had previously told us, that "so long as Cromwell 'remained in authority, so long was Bonner at his beck, 'and friend to his friends, and enemy to his enemies; as 'namely at that time to Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, 'who *never favoured Cromwell*, and therefore Bonner could 'not favour him, but *he and Winchester were the greatest* '*enemies that might be*. But so soon as Cromwell fell, 'immediately Bonner and Winchester pretended to be the 'greatest men that lived."[7] What are we to say to this? Perhaps we need not say anything immediately. Perhaps we may be allowed, in such a trifling matter as this, to reverse the usual mode of writing history, and defer speculation until we have inquired respecting facts. What are they?

Under the year 1534, Strype says, "This year also

[6] Vol. vii. p. 587. [7] Vol. v. p. 414.

'Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, put forth his 'book *De vera Obedientia; Of true Obedience*, which he 'wrote to justify the parliament in giving the king the title 'of Supreme Head of this church."[8] Anthony a Wood gives as one of the works of Bonner, "Preface to the Oration of Stephen Bish. of Winchester concerning true Obedience. Printed at London in Lat. 1534, 35;"[9] but his account is in other respects so palpably incorrect, that it is not worth while to criticise the date which he gives. Herbert[1], however, also represents the book as having been printed by Thomas Berthelet, the king's printer, in the year 1534. He is entitled to the highest respect and confidence when speaking of those books which he distinguishes as having been in his own possession, or under his own eye; but as this is not one of them, and as I do not find any other grounds than those which I have mentioned for supposing that there ever was such an edition, I am inclined to suspect that there has been some mistake. Perhaps the same confusion which I have already noticed, between Bishop Gardiner's book *De vera Obedientia* and Bishop Fox's *De vera Differentia;* the latter of which really was printed by Thomas Berthelet in the year 1534; but of Bishop Gardiner's work I suspect he printed only one edition, and that not until the next year.

This edition of 1535 is mentioned by Herbert as one of the books in his own possession, and correctly, though briefly, described by him[2]. There is a copy in the British Museum[3]. It is a small quarto of thirty-six leaves, numbered in a large Roman type. The only words on the title-page are STEPHANI VVINTON. EPISCOPI DE VERA OBEDIENTIA ORATIO. They are within the well-known Holbein border, having in

[8] Mem. I. i. 264. [9] Ath. Ox. ed. Bliss, vol. i. p. 370.

[1] That is, Herbert the bibliographer, (Typ. Ant. vol. i. p. 425,) for Lord Herbert has been quoted as an authority about this book, which he describes as Gardiner's "latin *Sermon* De vera Obedientia." I cannot imagine that it has any right to be called a "Sermon," and I do not know why it is called an "Oration," for the language seems obviously addressed, not to hearers, but readers. It is probable, however, that Lord Herbert was not very accurately acquainted with the book, for he tells us that it had a "preface of Dr. Bonner, Archdeacon of *Lichfield*," instead of Leicester.—*Life of Henry VIII.* p. 389.

[2] Ubi sup. p. 246.

[3] It appears by the catalogue of the Bodleian Library that there is one there also.

the bottom piece (which Dibdin has copied[4]) what Herbert calls, "boys in procession to the left." The back of the title is blank, and the work begins on the following page. On the back of the thirty-sixth leaf is the colophon, "LONDINI IN AEDIBUS THO. BERTHELETI REGII IMPRESSORIS EXCUSA. AN. M.D. XXXV. CVM PRIVILEGIO." I do not see anything which looks as if it was a second edition; and as I have mentioned Bonner's preface, I ought to add, that it contains only Gardiner's Oration, with no mention of Bonner, no preface by anybody, no dedication, no addition whatever.

Then there is an addition, which is said to have been printed at Hamburgh the next year, with this title[5]:—

STEPHANI WINTONIENSIS EPISCOPI DE VERA OBEdientia, oratio.

VNA CUM PRAEFATIONE EDMVNDI BONERI ARCHIDIACONI LEYcestrensis sereniss. Regiæ ma. Angliæ in Dania legati, capita notabiliora dictæ orationis complecten te.

IN QUA ETIAM OSTENDITVR caussam controuersiæ quæ inter ipsam sereniss. Regiam Maiestatem & Episcopū Romanum existit, longe aliter ac diuersius se habere, q; hactenus a vulgo putatum sit.

Hamburgi ex officina Francisci Rhodi. Mense Ianuario 1536

[4] Typ. Ant. Prel. Disq. Vol. i. p. xliv. The lower of the two engravings.

[5] This, and two subsequent title-pages, are not to be considered as perfect facsimiles; but they will furnish the reader with such a knowledge

This is, I believe, the first appearance of Bonner's Preface; but I shall have occasion to speak more particularly of this edition presently.

Another edition is said to have been published in this year at Strasburgh, in 8vo. I have never seen a copy, or met with a particular reference to one[6].

I do not know of any other edition, until in the year 1612, the tract was reprinted by Goldastus, who does not tell us what edition he followed[7]; but if there was one printed at Strasburgh, it was probably that one; for a long address to the reader which is prefixed to the Oration is subscribed by, "W. F. Capito, C. Hedio, M. Bucer et cæteri Ecclesiastæ Argentoratenses." This address bears no other mark of time or place that I see; and (what is most to be remarked) in the whole reprint I do not find one word of, or about, *any Preface by Bonner*.

The only other edition of the original Latin with which I am acquainted, is that published by Dr. Brown in his "Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum," &c. The reader who

---

of the words used, and of the spelling, disposition, and arrangement of them, and of the general appearance of the title-page as to capitals, figures, &c., as will enable him to identify any copy which he may meet with. Should he meet with any that materially varies from them, I shall be much obliged if he will let me know.

[6] In Simler's edition of Gesner's Bibliotheca, in the article on Bishop Gardiner (in v. *Steplanus*), it is stated that an edition was published at Strasburgh, in 1536, in 8vo. Bauer says—"Gardineri (Stephani) de vera Obedientia oratio. Argentor. 1536. in 8° Rarissima et notabilis est. Schelhorn Amoen. H.E. T.I. p. 837. sqq. Gerdes. p. 133." *Bibl. Libr. Rar.* Tom. ii. p. 10. I have not at present the means of referring to these authorities, but the latter of them elsewhere says—"Hunc libellum Argentorati curante W. F. Capitone 1536 8° recusum excerpsit doctiss. Schelhornius in Amœnit. Historico-Eccles. Tom. i. p. 837. seq." *Introd. in Hist. Ec.* Tom. iv. p. 237.

[7] In his Monarchia. S. Rom. Imp. Vol. i. p. 716. Printed at Hanover. There is at the beginning of the book a "Dissertatio de Auctoribus," which professes to give an account of the authors whose works follow. But after going through a good many, and before we come to the Oration, we are told "Qui sequuntur Tractatus nulla indigent dissertatione, quod et recentes sint eorum auctores, et scripta ad amussim polita," &c. The authors of the prefatory address begin by saying "Nacti nuper orationem de vera obedientia R. P. Stephani Episc. Wintoniensis, committere non potuimus, quin eam tibi communicaremus;" but I do not see that they throw any further light on the question.

turns to p. 800 of the second volume, will find both the Preface and the Oration, with a title almost literally the same as that of the Hamburgh edition, of which I have just given a copy, except that the humorous editor, having copied as far as "Archidiac. Leicestr.," relieved his feelings by inserting in a parenthesis, after those words, "(postea uero Episc. Londinensis pinguissimi et sanguinolenti,)" and also that "Hamburgi" is altered to "Juxta editionem Hamburgensem." This latter annunciation in the title would, of course, lead the reader to suppose that the whole work (Preface and Oration) were printed from the Hamburgh edition. And as he would be quite right in so doing, it would not be necessary to say anything about it here if Dr. Brown himself had not taken pains to tell him the contrary. As if to keep up the puzzle about the book, though, at the same time, with a real wish to be accurate, he has particularly specified that he printed the Oration from the *London* edition; while nothing can be more clear (to me, at least, with the very copy which he used on my table), than that the Oration in the Fasciculus is really reprinted from the *Hamburgh* edition, and not from the *London*[8]. What difference it may make, or whether any, I

[8] In Dr. Brown's preface is the following passage—"Boneri præfatio in Stephani Gardineri librum de vera obedientia Oxonio mihi missa est 'a viro doctissimo Georgio Hickes ecclesia Vigorniensis Decano, qui illum 'meis precibus diutius in omnibus academiæ bibliothecis, quæsiverat, in 'Baliolensi vero solum invenit: ipse autem Gardineri liber excuditur 'juxta veterem editionem Londinensem, cui deest ista præfatio (callide 'enim eam editioni illi subtraxerat hypocrita crassus, quasi rei pudefactus) 'quam nobis suppeditavit perhumaniter vir de ecclesia nostra et omnigena 'literatura bona præclare meritus Thomas Tenisonus S.T.P. et S. Martini 'in Campis Vicarius." There is something very humorous in the idea of the stupid hypocrite Bonner's withdrawing a preface in the manner here suggested. Dr. Brown was, however, mistaken in supposing that the copy from which he printed (though it does want the Preface) was of the old London edition. The copy in the Lambeth Library cannot be doubted to have belonged to Archbishop Tenison. In the "List of early-printed books" which I printed in 1843, I mentioned this volume. I was not then aware of this passage in Dr. Brown's preface, but it was so obvious that the book had been through a printer's hands, that I said, "It appears to have been used in printing some larger edition, in which it began on the Signature K 2, and went on to M 3, the signatures being here noted in the margin with a pen," p. 252. I ought to have said 5 K 2 and 5 M 3,

do not know. On a very cursory comparison of the two editions I did not perceive any variation; but it is not improbable that they may differ, and at any rate, the mistake should be corrected.

These are, as far as I know, all the editions of the original Latin; and they purport to have been printed respectively in the years 1535, 1536, 1612, and 1690. Whether there is any material, or even verbal, difference between these various editions, I am not able to say. Nor do I know whether, during the first eighteen years after its publication, the work attracted any degree of public attention, or was translated into any modern language. Of course, I say this merely taking the dates as they stand in the various title-pages, and keeping the question of their truth and accuracy quite open for future discussion.

There is, however, an English translation of the work, which has undergone (one may properly use the word in speaking of such very barbarous books) three editions. The earliest dated, and I believe, though it has been questioned, really the first of them, presents the following title-page:—

---

but I did not then, I suppose, observe, or make out the 5, which is plainly enough written over the references, to save the trouble of writing "K k k k k," and so on to "M m m m m," as the signatures actually stand in Brown's Fasciculus. Should this meet the eye of any one who can give me information with reference to what is here said respecting Baliol College, I shall be thankful for it. It does not appear from Dr. Brown's statement whether what he obtained from that source was printed or manuscript.

DE VERA OBEDIENCIA

RAtion made in Latine, by the ryghte Reuerend father in God Stephan B. of VVinchestre, nowe lord Chaūcellor of england, with the preface of Edmunde Boner, somtime Archedeacō of Leicestre, and the kinges maiesties embassadour in Denmarke, & sithence B. of London, touchinge true Obedience. Printed at Hamburgh in Latine, In officina Frācisci Rhodi Mense Ia. M.D.xxxvi. And nowe translated into english and printed by Michal Wood: with the Preface and conclusion of the traunslatour. ¶ From Roane. xxvi. of Octobre. M.D.liii. In Readinge marke the Notes in the margine A double mynded man, is inconstāt in al his waies. Iac. i.

It is a small octavo, in fact not larger than the common duodecimo size. The first twelve leaves are occupied with the title and translator's preface. Then Bonner's Preface and the Oration occupy sixty leaves. After this, the Translator again addresses the Reader, and occupies eleven pages. The body of the work is in Roman type; the letter w being of uncouth shape, and wrong size, either because it was printed abroad, or it make it look as if it had been; and the marginal notes are in a small genuine black letter[9]. Without prejudice to

[9] It will be seen that the three large letters in the second line of the title do not answer to this description. They belong to the German type into which the Gothic letter passed. I give them because they are

any question which may be raised as to the place of its birth, we may, for distinction's sake, call it the "Roane" edition.

A second edition of this English version professes to have followed the first very speedily, and has the following title-page.

De vera obedientia

An oration made in Latine / by the right Reuerēde father in God Stephā bishop of Winche stre now Lorde Chāu celour of Eng lande

With the Preface of Edmonde Bonner than Archideacon of Leicestre, and the kinges Maiesties Embassadour in Denmar ke, and now bisshop of London: ton ching true obedience. Printed at Hāburgh in Latine, in officina Franscisci Rhodi Mense Januario, 1536.

And now transla= ted in to Englishe, and printed efisones, in Rome, before ye castle of .S. Angel, at the signe of S. Peter. In nobembre, Anno do. M. D. Liij.

This edition is, like the former, in a small octavo form, though with a page considerably larger than the other. It is printed, both text and marginal notes, in a sharp, thin, and not genuine, black letter, on fifty leaves, the last of which (notwithstanding the announcement on the title-page) bears the well-known device of a London printer, Hugh Singleton. It is hardly necessary to say that there is no more probability of its having been printed by him, than of its having been printed at Rome; though, perhaps, we might find some grounds for suspecting that it (perhaps I might say the Roane edition, also) was printed in England.

what were used in printing Coverdale's Bible, and by several English printers afterwards.

But, without discussing or prejudicing this question, we may call this the "Rome" edition.

The third edition, being a reprint from this second, was published by Mr. Stevens, in London, as lately as the year 1832, by way of Appendix to his Life of Bradford. It is right to mention this reprint, not only because I am endeavouring to give a list of all the editions both of the original and of the translation, but because all the old editions, whether Latin or English, are scarce books; and the reader who feels any curiosity to look at the work, is more likely to have access to this modern edition than to any other; and he should be premonished that it is executed with astonishing ignorance and incorrectness[1].

[1] Many readers will feel that I can hardly say more in a few words than by stating, that this piece of "Martyrological Biography," as the author entitles it, is quite worthy to take its place with the Seeley edition of Fox. I speak, of course, with reference to the reprint of Gardiner's work which it contains, for I have not had occasion to look at any other part. Take the following specimens of what seems almost unaccountable carelessness—"do not go about traiterously," for "do not *only* go," &c., page lxvi., line 28. "If their *works* and writings," for "if their *words*," &c., lxix. 27. "To worship a pretty white coated *casket*," for "*cake*," lxxii. 8 from bottom. "*Therewith* the consent of the whole church," for "*than with* the consent," lxxvii. 25. "And *prefaced* the same also in his deeds," for "and *performed* the same," &c., lxxxvii. 24. "Giveth us more plain *meaning* of this," for "*warning*," *ibid.* 28. "If *he had* to call him," for "if *ye lust* to call him," xcv. *ult.* "This indeed is the most *special* way," for "the most *spedy*," cii. 17. "For their *beauty*," for "their *duetie*," cvi. 1. "*When* they have taken," for "*where* they have taken," cvi. 14, and after line 25, a whole line omitted. "Should be called also," for "should *not* be," *ibid. penult.* "It was meet to *mistake*," for "to *mislike*," cxii. 5. "In *haly* estate of worldly power," for "*hault* estate," cxvii. 5 *from bottom.* "Therefore take away the *other* from the cause, for the *other* ought to be a servant of truth, and cannot nor ought *not* to be prejudicial;" for *other* read *othe* twice, and put out *not*, cxxxvi. 24. Much more might be adduced in proof of the very negligent and careless way in which the reprint has been made; but there are other blunders of a grosser character, indicating, not only negligence, but such a degree of ignorance as should have prevented the editor from meddling with the matter, and as is quite fearful when thus combined with a free and easy method of altering the text at his discretion. For instance, at p. lxvii., (where, by the way, there is a good deal left out,) we read of "piurours," a class of persons of whom few people, I suppose, have ever heard. The editor was so entirely unacquainted with books belonging to the same period as that which he was editing, as not to know that a p with a transverse stroke across its tail (p), was a most common contraction for "per," and that the "double-faced" people of whom his author spake were "per-

The Roane and Rome editions, however, though generally considered as (and substantially, I suppose, they really are) one and the same version—perhaps, by the way, one of the most barbarous versions of Latin into a sort of English that ever was perpetrated—present a great many variations, some of which may be just worth mentioning.

In the first place, at the very outset, instead of a blank page at the back of the title, the Romé edition has in black-letter—

> "The Contentes
> of Wynchesters boke.
> The Kinge supreme head of ye churche
> The Bishop of Rome hath non au
> toritie in Englande
> The Kinges mariage with the la
> dy Anne, chaste and laufull

iurours," or "perjurers." But he was content to print nonsense which he could not himself pretend to understand. And so he was two pages farther on—who or what are "kabies?" One would imagine they must be the people who used the celebrated "kimes"—but no, it is merely that the reprinter of a printed book is so little acquainted with the type of the time, as to take a capital R for a capital K, and so, from being "ruffling Rabyes," the papistical prelates who made sermons and orations have been turned into "Kabies," instead of "rabbies." He modernized it as far as he could, explain it he could not, but he was content to let it stand, and say nothing about it. A still grosser and more absurd specimen of the same sort of ignorance and absolute incompetency to read the book which he had undertaken to edit, is afforded by a note on p. cxi., which is literally as follows:—

> "If the Bishop of Rome were Christ's Vicar, he would not have practised ing-gliges.—WOOD."

The reader will understand that in the original this is a marginal note, and the narrow margin required the last word of it to be divided. It is hardly worth the trouble, but if the reader will turn the i into a j, invert the n, remove the hyphen, and supply the common mark over the next i, to indicate that an n is omitted, he will arrive at the word "jugglinges." How could any man, especially one who so freely used his discretion about inserting the marginal notes of the translator, think of disfiguring his book by what he must have felt to be nonsense? But superadded nonsense is not the worst effect produced by this tampering of ignorance, as the following specimen may show. In the old edition, the translator speaks of certain valiant soldiers, who loved to sleep in a whole skin, and he compares them to "Gnatoes." This the editor (guiltless of Terence) did not understand, and so he has actually stripped the poor parasite of his capital, and printed the passage thus—"like gnats with ait, aio, negat, nego," p. lxx. What did he think the gnats did, and how did they do it?

The Diuorce of the lady Katherine donne by Goddes lawe. etc.
The autoritie of Goddes worde, only to be obeyde.
Mennes traditions repugne in most thinges to Goddes truthe
The word of truth lay buried, whan the bish. of Rome ruled here.
The cōming agayne of light confessed
Folishe and vnlaufull othes and vowes not to be kepte
And other which these incarnate deuilles impudently and traiterously goo about to subuerte at this day."

In the Roane edition, as I have already said, the translator adds an appendix of eleven pages, addressed to "the Christen Reader." In the Rome edition this is all omitted, and there are only two leaves after the end of the Oration, two pages and a half of which are occupied by matter headed—

"℄ Resistaunce of ye Gospells is a most manifest sygne of dampnacion."

But the minor variations are numberless; and it may, perhaps, be sufficient to quote one specimen, and to make one general remark, the tendency of both being to give the reader a clearer idea of the difference between the two editions, and a ground for forming an opinion as to which was published first. It is this—that as far as I have compared them, the phraseology of the Rome edition is generally (not quite always) less rude, coarse, and scurrilous, than the Roane text; and I think that whoever reflects on even the specimen which follows, will believe, though an opposite opinion has been maintained, that the passage, which I here give according to the Roane text, was the original, and that the Rome text, which substitutes what is here in *italics* for what is here in brackets, was the corrected edition. I do not know whether the mode of printing which I have adopted is the best for the purpose; but I trust that the reader will understand, that if he reads straight forward all that is in Roman type, as if there were no brackets, and omits what is in *italics*, he will have the passage as it stands in the Roane edition; if he reads it, omitting what is

included in brackets, and taking instead what is in *italics*, he will have the Rome text.

¶ The *Preface of the* Translatour to the gentle Reader.

I haue hertofore (with no smale admiration) readde a certaine Sermon made in English, before our late souereiene Lorde King Henry the .viii, about .xiiii. yeres past, by D, Tonstal *than* B. of Duresme, and set furthe in print (by like) for his owne glorye, or rather purgation, beyng suspected (*and not without cause*) to be a fauourer of the pretensed autoritie, *and* Antichristian power [and detestable enormities] of the B. of Rome whereof he [semeth at this daye to be] *is* bent *at this day* with other his complices *to shew himself* (that Sermon notwithstanding) not onely to be [no hinderour, but also] *a* frindelye fauourer, *but an open diligent* [a trustie] proctour, and [an open defēdour, much to be lamented, in respect of his excellente giftes, and vertues otherwise.

Ther is also] a certē Oratiō *also written* in latin [made] by D. Samson, [late] *than* B. of Chichester, and now the double faced epicureous bite shepe of Co*ventry and* Lich*field* [which Sermon and Oratiō, proue and make learned assercion] aswel *for the proof and assertion* of the kinges supremacy, by the vndoubted truth of Gods vnfayling worde as *of* the [necessary and] iust abrogation of the sayde b.*ishop* of Romes fained power out of england. [And albe it men iustlye maruaile at these mennes inconstancy, seyinge howe they sayde and wrote than, and how slepperli thei speke and doo nowe, yet thei are not muche compted vppon. because that lyke as Doresme was] *By which Sermon and oracion I beīge indifferently instructed in the truthe for those dayes in som poyntes cannot chose but marvaile somwhat at this their so sodayne alteracion of mynde and procedīges presently sene to al mēnes understonding. Howbeit for as muche a Tōstall hathe ben* longe [a goo] reputed a still dreamynge Saturne, alwaies imagininge mischiefe, [so is] *and* Samson [known to be] an idelbellied carnal epicure, [that] *which* for worldly honour, and paltring pelfes sake hath euer holden with the hare, and runne with the hounde *as they say:* and [as he hath theuishlye spoiled and made away pore mens liuings, the patrimonye of his bishoprike, so would he] (if he were bidden) *would* saye Christ [was] *were* a hangman and his father a thiefe. [Therefore, it forceth not what suche dubble mynded marchauntes[2] write or speak, seing (as saint Iames sayth) thei are in-

[2] This word may appear as strange to some readers of modern books as it did to an anonymous writer who, four or five years ago, published a very large joke in the form of a burlesque Life and Defence of Bishop Bonner, "By a Tractarian British Critic." When this writer found that Bishop saying of Latimer, "as for this *merchant* I know him well," and adding, "as touching the other *merchant* Hooper, I have never seen him before," he did not know what to make of it, having probably been led by something which he had seen or heard to connect the names of Latimer and Hooper with ecclesiastical, rather than mercantile, affairs. Accordingly, with the characteristic boldness of ignorance, he struck out the word *merchant* from the text, and substituted *mechant;* showing that

constant in all their waies, and of no satled] *I compted not muche vpon them, nor thought that their Sermon and Oracion proceeded of any* perswasion of cõscience but [forecast altogether, howe] to serue the time, as the cõmon [study &] practice of [al] that foxie generation is.

[And in like sort] *But now of late* I chaunced [lately] to read an excellent, and a right notable [learned] Oration, entitled De vera Obediẽcia, made in latine [nere] *about* .xx. yeres past by D. Stephan *Gardener, than* B.*isshop* of VVinchestre, [and] now Lord Chancellour and comon cutthrot of England, touchinge as well the kinges supremaci and absolute power (vnder God) of the church of England, and the necessary diuorce (as he calleth it) of the said king Henry the eighte from the quenes [graces] Mother that now is, [and] *together with* the lauful and chast mariage (for so he termeth the matter) [solemnised] *had* betwene the sayde Kynge and quene Anne, to consist by the vnfailynge almightie word or GOD: as also concernynge the false fained authoritie and vsurped power of the bishoppe of Rome, and vnlaufull or vnadvysed othees and vowes: ioyned with the [pleasaunte] preface of doughtie Doctoure Boner, then archdeacõ of Leicestre, [and the kynges Embassadoure in Denmarke], gaping to be [made] a bishop as he *is now by the way of usurpocion* [was afterwarde] of London *for the commendacion and praise of the same Oracion.*

I think the reader will believe that these two editions

---

if he did not understand English, he was not altogether ignorant of French, and knew how to adorn his work with some such flowers of conjectural criticism and humorous emendation as should render it worthy of the Seeley press from which it was to issue. It might be vulgar, but it would be not only truth, but good English, if a reviewer were to say of this author, that it was "hard to *deal* with such a *chap*;" and perhaps most readers would pass over the phrase without once thinking of the words "dealer and chapman," which still linger amidst our phraseology in a sense which has now become obsolete with respect to "merchant." This work is anonymous; but in case any future Placcius should be inclined to inquire about its authorship, three marks may be mentioned as possibly offering a clue. First, some other exhibitions of ignorance, such as I have mentioned—as for instance, in support of his assumed character of an ultra-tractarian, the author dates his dedication, "October 23, Feast of St. Ignatius Loyola." As a piece of humour this is, perhaps, equal to anything in the whole book; but not being much at home in the Calendar, he has unluckily got hold of St. Ignatius the Patriarch, instead of St. Ignatius the Jesuit, whose day is the 31st of July. Again, any man who should affect to write a life of Bishop Bonner, though only in a solemn jest of less than four hundred pages, while under a belief that the Cotton MSS. are at Oxford, should really be himself placed in the British Museum as a national curiosity. See p. 13; and it is likely that where there are such things, there are plenty of such like. A second mark is, that the book is printed at Durham. A third, and the most observable, is, that it quotes a "charge" delivered by one "of the Dignitaries of the church," named Townsend.

were printed in the order which their title-pages suggest; but, supposing their dates to be relatively true as to the order of precedence between them, do we not begin to feel some surprise at those dates themselves? The former edition purports to have issued "from Roane, xxvi. of Octobre," in the year 1553; and the later from Rome "in Novembre" of the same year. It will be seen, therefore, that the date of this Roane book is only eleven days after Laurence Saunders's sermon, at Allhallows, Bread-street. To be sure, Gardiner had been Lord Chancellor ever since the 23rd of August, but how had he earned the title of "common cut-throat of England"? Whose throat had he or anybody else cut? What had "Doughtie D. Bonner" done *by that time?* In short, does not this style of writing, as well as even the coupling together of the names, rather savour of a later period, and a subsequent state of things and of feelings? Does it not look as if there was something not quite accordant with strict truth in the *times* so punctually set forth in the titles of these books, any more than in the *places* assigned to them by the same authority?

And now that these suspicions are raised, let us go back a little, and look again at that Hamburgh edition of 1536, which was the first to present the public with Archdeacon Bonner's Preface, and from which Dr. Brown's reprint in his Fasciculus, as well as the English translation, are professedly made. I propose this, because there is something very curious about the early history of printing in Hamburgh. I lay the following story, relating to that subject, before the reader, without pretending to vouch for the truth of all its particulars; but at the same time assuring him, that in such sources of information as I have had opportunity to consult, I have found nothing to contradict any of them.

The Story of Hamburgh.

One fine morning, in the year 1491, when all the inhabitants of Hamburgh were deeply engaged in business and pleasure—that is, either in actual buying and selling, or in bargaining—so that even the gate-keeper (it is not known of which gate) had stepped up into the city to learn the state of exchange between Hamburgh and Berlin[3], two men, whose outlandish appearance afforded no infor-

[3] Some readers may think I ought to have said Lubeck, perhaps, or some other place more known in the early history of commerce. But as

mation as to the place whence they came—indeed, I believe it has never to this day been even guessed at—contrived to slip in unobserved. How they managed to bring in with them all the materials and machinery necessary for establishing a printing-office is not known; but it may well be imagined that nobody observed them, in a city where every man had his hand in his pocket, his heart in his purse, and his head in his ledger. So John and Thomas Brocard, or Borchard, or Burchard, with their typographical gear, went forward unmolested, until they came to the vacant space in front of the Town-house; where, as it seemed to them that they should have plenty of room and be in nobody's way, they set up their press, and incontinently fell to work, printing a folio book in great Gothic type to the honour of the Virgin Mary.

All that day, as every day, everybody in Hamburgh was minding his own business, and the Proconsuls and Consuls (as the citizens loved to call what more modern folks would designate as the Burgomasters and Town-Council) were assembled in the Town-house, to mind the business of every body else. Nobody, therefore, heeded the printers, until the municipal grandees came forth, after a long day's discussion on a new tariff, and were struck with amazement by the strange novelty. John and Thomas, by incredible skill and diligence at case and press, had just worked off their book, and hastily gathering and folding a few copies, presented one to each of the senators who had surrounded them, and were gazing in silent wonder at their proceedings. Most of the Consuls, indeed, had little idea of what was going forward; but two or three of the most enlightened looked at each other knowingly, and in a way that plainly said, *this will not do*. "Aye, aye," said one of the Proconsuls, at length, giving utterance to the thoughts of the others as well as his own, "If this is allowed it will be the ruin of the place. The exchange will be deserted by book-reading fools, and the workhouse crammed with book-writing beggars. Trade will be ruined, and all the profit of our exports and imports together will not meet our poor-rates. We have staved off this new-invented folly during twenty or thirty years that it has stultified Mentz and Cologne, Frankfort and Strasburgh, and I know not what places beside, and we must

---

the exact truth is not known, I do it on purpose to give the good city of Berlin a lift, as Mr. Cattley has done in his edition of Fox, by telling us that in the year 1538 it was honoured by the presence of Henry the Eighth, while his Vicar-General Cromwell was for some inscrutable reason quartered at Utrecht, or, as the cautious editor (not to depart at once too much from the ancient orthography which he is correcting,) is pleased to spell it "Entrecht." The proof of this is a letter from no less a person than Archdeacon Bonner, then bishop elect of Hereford, to the Lord Cromwell. The antiquated mode of spelling, which the editor has so carefully corrected, would in all likelihood have led some readers to quite another part of the world. They would have been liable to suppose that *Byrling* and *Ewridge* were the two seats of the Lord Burgavenny in Kent and Sussex, better known to modern readers (especially the readers of Nichol's Royal Progresses) by the visits of Queen Elizabeth.—See Fox, vol. v. p. 152.

not give way now. In spite of bad example, not a type has ever yet been set up in the good city of Hamburgh, and we are not going to begin now."

John and Thomas rubbed their thumbs on their aprons, and looked sheepishly at each other. It was clear that they had made a great mistake. But they were sharp fellows, and in great emergencies great wits jump. They formed a sudden resolution, made a sudden start, ran off at full speed, and were never more seen or heard of.

The senators stood still and stared after them, but they stirred not a step. Perhaps they had some sympathy with Dogberry, and were not sorry to get rid of bad company at so little expence. For that matter, indeed, when the property which John and Thomas had abandoned in their flight came to be carried to account as firewood and old metal, there was a balance of some dollars in favour of the city chest. But so deeply were the Proconsuls, and Consuls, and Citizens, and indeed all the inhabitants, impressed with a sense of the danger which they had so narrowly escaped, that so long as any one of those senators lived (and it was more than forty years) no man, woman, or child, ever printed a book, or a bit of one, in the good city of Hamburgh; though none of them knew all the particulars which have just been laid before the reader, some of which have never, indeed, been divulged until this present occasion seemed to call for them.

I have already said that I do not vouch for the truth of all things contained in this story, and I hope the reader does not think that I believe it all myself, or wish him to believe more of it than he likes. I merely give it as what *may* be true—that is, what cannot be contradicted on the authority of any of the common sources of bibliographical information. This must, I think, appear to every reflecting person very remarkable; and it will, perhaps, be hardly believed, unless I state the case more plainly and technically.

If the reader will turn to Panzer's "Annales Typographici,"[4] he will find what that writer has to say of printing in Hamburgh during the fifteenth century. It is all comprised in a notice of one single book, entitled, "Laudes beate Marie virginis," said, in its colophon, to have been printed (if not with all the circumstances here stated) by the persons, and at the time, specified in this Story of Hamburgh. Panzer states that it was the first book, and the only one, printed there before the year 1500. In accordance with this, Santander tells us that this book, "est la seule impres-'sion faite dans la ville anséatique d'Hamburg, avant l'an '1500, et par conséquent Joh. et Thomas Borchard sont les

[4] Vol. iv. p. 453.

'seuls imprimeurs de cette ville."[5] Dr. Falkenstein, in his history of early printing, published so recently as 1840, has nothing to offer against these statements, and acknowledges that the ancient city of Hamburgh, so celebrated in the history of German commerce, can boast of only one book printed in the fifteenth century[6].

One book, and only one book, and that by printers who are not known to have printed any other book, there or elsewhere, before or after. Surely this is very singular. Dr. Falkenstein gives us a list of 176 places in which printing had been carried on before this year 1491, and it is strange enough that Hamburgh should not be among them. But it is incomparably more strange that, when the art had penetrated that city in the year 1491—when a press had been set up and had produced one book—it should have disappeared and remained unheard of for forty-five years. And not only did the newly-arrived art disappear, but the artists also vanished, not from Hamburgh only, but from all human ken. The migrations of early printers are notorious, and nobody would have been surprised to learn that John and Thomas Brocard had been next heard of at the far end of Christendom; but I am not aware that their names are to be found connected with any other time, or place, or book, than that single one which they are said to have printed at Hamburgh in 1491, or that there is, or ever was anything else in the whole world to attest that such persons ever existed.

Now when we consider how easy it was for any one of the printers who really were hard at work in so many other places, to put a false name of place or printer in a book—how very possible it is that some one of them may have been led, by some reason or some caprice which we cannot fully understand, to do in this case, what we know to have been done in so many others—shall we not be led to suspect

[5] "Essai historique sur l'origine de l'Imprimerie, ainsi que sur l'histoire de son établissement dans les villes, bourgs, monastères et autres endroits de l'Europe."—p. 433.

[6] "Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst in ihrer Entstehung und Ausbildung, &c. Ein Denkmal zur vierten Säcular-Feier der Typographie." He says, "Die alte Hansestadt Hamburg, die in der Geschichte des deutschen Handels eine so ausgezeichnete Rolle spielt, hat nur ein einzigen Druck aufzuweisen, welcher dem fünfzehnten Jahrhunderte angehört. Es ist 'Laudes,'" &c. p. 198.

that the book of "Laudes" bearing the date of 1491 was not really a native of the city of Hamburgh? Especially because, though I have more particularly insisted on the fact that no book is known to have been printed therefore before that time, we must also bear in mind that there is no proof, so far as I know, of anything having been printed there for forty-five years after.

ESSAY XVIII.

GARDINER AND BONNER. No. II.

"DE VERA OBEDIENTIA."

THE circumstances stated in the preceding Essay are, perhaps, sufficient to throw some degree of suspicion on the work which has been handed down to us as the joint production of those two well-known prelates, Gardiner and Bonner.

Briefly recapitulated, so far as is necessary for the purpose of carrying on our argument, the matter stands thus:—We are told that in the year 1535, Bishop Gardiner published a treatise, "De vera Obedientia," in London. That in 1536 it was reprinted at Hamburgh, with a recommendatory preface by Dr. Bonner, then Archdeacon of Leicester, and afterwards Bishop of London.

This may naturally, for various reasons, appear to reflecting persons a very singular proceeding; but waiving, for the present, all other considerations, let us go to the particular point at which we arrived in the preceding Essay, and which was this—namely, that it was, to say the least, very strange that this new edition of the Bishop of Winchester's book, thus patronised and prefaced by the Archdeacon of Leicester, should have been printed at a place where there had previously been so very little printing of any kind. I stated that no bibliographer whose works I had the opportunity to consult, had mentioned any book whatever as having been printed there before the year 1491.

This, considering how many presses had by that time been

set up elsewhere, and how many years they had been in active operation, may be considered as not a little remarkable. Still more wonderful, however, it must appear to every considerate reader, that if *one* book was printed there in 1491, so little should have been done for so long a period *after* that time. True it is that things may have been done which were not recorded, and which are unknown merely because they had no chronicler. Books may have been printed at Hamburgh in the beginning of the sixteenth century which were unknown to Panzer, but certainly not enough to affect the argument; and with his Annals before me, I ventured to express an opinion that no book was printed there during the forty-five years which succeeded 1491—that is, until this very year 1536, when the joint production of Gardiner and Bonner is said to have been printed. In stating this opinion, however, I felt that whoever should look out my authorities might think that they did not fully support my statement, though I did not burthen the matter with details. Indeed those details would not be worth entering into at all, if it were not that beside their reference to the particular case before us, they have a more general, and an important, bearing on the subject with which we are engaged.

As we have seen what Panzer gives as occurring at Hamburgh before the year 1500, (which is only the single volume of 1491, said to have been printed by artists otherwise altogether unknown,) let us turn to the second part of his Annals[1], and see what he states respecting the period immediately following—that is, up to the year 1536, being the forty-fifth after the flight of the Brocards from Hamburgh.

In the first place,—and I grant in contradiction of the opinion which I have stated,—he gives under the year 1527 (only the thirty-sixth of the Brocardian Hegira) one single book which he found to have been *supposed* by some persons to be a production of the Hamburgh press. At the same time, neither he, nor anybody else, has ever pretended that it bore upon it any name of place or printer. Indeed, I do not know that it is thought to exhibit anything in type, or workmanship, or any internal evidence whatever, by which

[1] Vol. vii. p. 117.

the place of its origin might be decided. But there is, I grant, one circumstance (forming, however, I submit, an obviously insufficient ground for this opinion) which has led some persons to think that this book was secretly and clandestinely printed in the particularly non-printing city of Hamburgh. So strange it is that at every step of this inquiry we meet with some petty mystery. The first book which we come to after thirty-six years of total barrenness, is only *supposed* to have been printed there, if indeed the mere supposition is still entertained by anybody. And of all the books in the world, what book does the reader suppose it was that broke the long slumber of the Hamburgh press? Not a new edition of the "Laudes" in Latin—the Proconsuls and Consuls had changed all that,—but Tyndal's New Testament in the English tongue. All that Panzer has to say of the year is this:

"MDXXVII.

"1. PENTATEUCHUS et NOVUM TESTAMENTUM *anglice ex versione Gulielmi Tyndal.* 1527.

"*Maitt. II. p.* 685."

It is hardly worth while to trace the authorities for this, because it is probable that those who suggested, or accepted, Hamburgh as the place where that work was printed, were not aware of any improbability, and only took it for granted that, as Tyndal was said to have got away from England to Hamburgh, and also said to have printed his testament soon after that time, he had, as a matter of course, printed it at that place. To those who were probably not aware of any thing to suggest a reason why a book might not as probably be printed there as anywhere else, this was quite natural; but after what we have just seen, and considering how much more easy, and how much less expensive, it would be to send a manuscript to some one of the many places where there certainly were printers and presses at work, than to introduce secretly into a town in which there seems to have been no printing, (or, to say the least, none for six-and-thirty years,) all the materials and persons requisite for the clandestine printing of a book in a foreign language, which, after all, for anything that appears, might just as well have been printed elsewhere—considering, I say, all this, we may, perhaps, very reasonably doubt whether Tyndal's Testament

should stand where Panzer has placed it[2]. If, however, this book was really printed at Hamburgh in 1527, it must stand by itself, an isolated fact, a sort of little Eddystone in the barren sea of time; for three years elapse before we come to a notice of another *supposed* book. The next article in Panzer is—

"MDXXX.

"2. JOANNES HEPINUS de Romanae ecclesiae imposturis. *Epistola data est Hamburgi MDXXX. octavo Cal. Jun.* 8.

"*Maitt. Ind. I. p.* 477."

Why surely we might as well put down Dr. Brown's Fasciculus, which we have been talking of, as printed at Sundridge, in Kent, because the doctor's Epistola data est "Sundrigiæ nonis Octobr. MDCLXXXIX." Dr. Brown was Rector of Sundridge, and Dr. Hück (who chose to call himself Æpinus) was pastor at Hamburgh. If either of these divines thought fit to write a letter, it is probable that he would write it at, and date it from, the place where he lived; and it is highly probable, that if anybody saw fit, for any reason, to forge a letter from either of them, he might be deep enough to think of this. But to put down a book as printed at a place, merely because the prefatory epistle is dated from it, is so monstrous, that it would not be worth while to say another word about the matter, were it not that the mystery of Hamburgh hangs over this book also, and involves a point or two which are worth our notice, because the genuineness of the literature of that period and the good faith of the men concerned in it, (especially of those belonging to the party of the Reformation,) is a very important matter with reference to our inquiry.

(1.) In the first place, did this author ever write any such book? He was a very well known man, and his works

[2] Maittaire, thus quoted as his only authority by Panzer, refers us only to Le Long's Bibliotheca Sacra; and Le Long (vol. ii. p. 337) quotes only "Hollandus in Heroologia Anglicana," which I have not at present opportunity to consult. Of course this matter has been more fully investigated since the days of Panzer; and whoever studies the information respecting the history of Tyndal's translation and editions of the New Testament, which has been zealously and ably collected by Mr. Offor, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Lea Wilson, will need very little argument to persuade him of the probability that this work of Tyndal's was not printed at Hamburgh.

seem to have been popular. But I do not find this one mentioned either by his biographer or his bibliographer—that is by Melchior Adam, who wrote his life, or by Simler who allots him a very respectable space in his edition of Gesner's Bibliotheca. Both of them give lists of his works, but neither of them mentions anything that can be mistaken for this one. (2.) If Æpinus did write such a book, did he print it at Hamburgh, for that is our immediate question? It may be said, "Of course he would print it where he lived;" but there is one circumstance which strongly forbids this assumption—namely, that all his other works (as far as I have been able to find) were printed elsewhere. Simler, as I have already said, gives a list of his works, and he distinguishes between those printed at *Basil* and those at *Frankfort*, but says not a word of any one having been printed at Hamburgh. Why did the Superintendent of Hamburgh send away his books from that place, to be printed elsewhere, long after the year 1530, (Simler gives no work earlier than 1541,) and why did other Hamburgh writers do the same?—as it would be easy to show they did, if it were needful to follow up this point with further authorities. (3.) There is something worthy of notice in the title of this supposed Hamburgh book, or rather in the description of the author. His name, as I have already stated, was Hück, or (as he tells us, some people pronounced it) Hüch; and when, after escaping the danger into which the reforming zeal of his youth had led him, he saw fit to conceal himself, by hellenizing his name into *ἀπτεινὸς*, he knew better than to prefix an aspirate[3].

[3] In the prefatory epistle to his "Commentarius in Psalmum XIX," printed at *Frankfort*, 1545, addressed to Joachim II., Marquis of Brandenburg, he gives a notice of his early life which, as the book is not common, may be worth extracting:—

"Olim adolescens cum formabam juventutis studia, et gubernabam 'scholam in Marchia, valde fœlicem judicassem me, si in hac luce, nunc 'demum ibi exorta, mihi tum agere licuisset, vel etiam in gravi difficul-'tate: sed Domino tum aliter fuit visum: dedi tum pro meis viribus 'operam ut Evangelium in Marchia innotesceret, sed Satanas cum suis 'mancipiis, monachis et sacrificis, tunc et meos, et plerorumque aliorum 'bonorum conatus, qui tum mecum eandem rem ibidem agebant, impe-'divit, et me falsis criminationibus delatum, apud Tuæ Cels. patrem, pru-'dentissimum Principem, liberaliumque studiorum amantem, mendaciis-'que deformatum, detrusit in carcerem, objecit morti, et invisum reddidit 'Marchiæ præpotentibus, qui tum zelo quodam, Evangelicæ et incorruptæ

He called himself, and his son continued the name, Æpinus; and, though he is, of course, often named by various writers, I know of only one place beside this where I have seen him designated Hepinus. (4.) I may as well plainly express my suspicion that the work is not genuine, and that some of our countrymen had a hand in the matter. That Æpinus was known to some of them who would not have hesitated to borrow his name, is beyond doubt, for he was over in this country in the year 1534. Some of his works were subsequently translated into English, and it is in one of those English translations alone that I find him called Hepinus. John Day, it seems, printed without date, "A 'very fruitful and godly exposition vpon the 15 psalm of 'David called, Lord who shall dwell in thy tabernacle. 'Made by John Epinus, preacher to the church of Ham-'borough, and translated into English by N. L. 8vo."[4]

'doctrinæ ignari, defendebant Papisticos errores: tandem etiam ex car-'cere eductum, compulit me e patria commigrare, apud externos sedes 'quærere, et apud ignotos in exilio agere, et cum multis ac magnis 'difficultatibus luctari, ubi ob adversariorum pertinax odium et cupidi-'tatem mihi nocendi, etiam coactus sum mutare gentilitium nomen, et 'juxta piissimorum, doctissimorum, ac prudentissimorum virorum con-'silium, pro teutonico gentilitio nomine Hück (quod et Hüch a multis 'effertur, et scribitur) Græca voce *αἰτειὸς* uti, quæ magis congruere 'videbatur, et quæ tantum uno, aut ad summum immutatis duobus 'elementis, Germanice gentilitium nomem meum sonat, quod adhuc re-'tineo quod omnibus passim notius sit."—(*Sig.* A. iv.) A good deal of curious matter respecting him may be found in the Philocalia Epistolica of J. H. a Seelen. p. 8—27.

[4] Herbert's Ames, vol. i. p. 673. This is the only instance in which I have observed his name without the diphthong, except in Sleidan's Comm. Lib. xxi. p. 658, and, by the way, in Le Courayer's translation (vol. ii, p. 30) he stands in the text as "Jean Repin," a blunder which is not corrected in the biographical note professing to give an account of him. As to this book of his, there seems to be some little puzzle about it, as about everything connected with this question. Bauer (Bib. Lib. Rar. Supp. Tom. i. p. 21) thus describes the work of which that mentioned by Herbert is a translation;—"Æpini (Joh.) in Psalmum XV. 'Commentarius, in quo de iustificatione, de vita christiani hominis, de 'votis et iuramentis, de consuetudine impiorum vitanda, de contractibus '&c. agitur-Recens nunc primum æditus. Argentor. 1543. Liber 'perrarus, &c." Now the book from which I have just quoted a part of the dedication, is his commentary on the XIX. Psalm. It bears the date of Frankfort, 1545, (two years, that is, later than this Strasburgh edition of the Commentary on the XV. Psalm,) and yet in that same epistle to the Marquis Joachim, he professes that he is dedicating to his highness the first fruits of his labours in the way of commentary on the

And Henry Bynneman printed at London, in 1570, a book entitled "De arte concionandi formulæ, vt breues, ita doctæ 'et piæ. Joanne Reuchlino Phorcensi, Anonymo quodam 'rhapsodo, Philippo Melancthone, D. Ioanne Hepino 'Autoribus," &c.[5]

But enough has been said about this author, and his works; especially considering that our only question is, whether a certain book on the Impostures of the Romish Church, circulated under his name, was (whether genuine or spurious) printed at Hamburgh. If it really was, the production of it seems to have been an effort from which the press of that city did not soon recover. Of six subsequent years,

Psalms, in terms which make it impossible to believe that he had published a similar commentary on a different psalm two years before. After stating various reasons for publishing, he proceeds: "Hæc et plura alia, 'quæ hic prolixius persequi nolo, induxerunt me ut illis morem gererem 'qui a me contendebant meas annotatiunculas in Psalmos in nostra schola 'dictatas, edendas esse ut etiam in illorum manus venirent, quibus non 'fuit data facultas eas coram audire aut calamo excipere, et præcipue 'commentarium in Psalmum XIX. His monitoribus cum permiserim ut 'commentariolus in Psalmum xix. Typographo ad imprimendum darentur '. . . . . constitui inscribere ac dedicare eum Illustr. tuæ Cels. . . . . 'Hic commentarius cum omnium primum sit, quem ipse publicaverim, 'tuaque Celsitudo meæ patriæ Princeps sit . . . . . jure quodam videor 'me debere T. Cels. has primitias mearum lucubrationum," &c.—*Sig.* bb. ij. It is possible that there may be some force in the "*ipse* publicaverim," and that he may refer to things with which he had, or had not, some connexion, being published by others with his name; but the whole style of the dedication is not what we should expect from a Superintendent of Hamburgh who had fifteen years before printed a book against the Church of Rome in his own city; and whether he did that, or whether somebody else did it for him, is our question. The reader is requested to remember this, and not to fall into the idea that I am attempting to deny that a book with that title, or something like it, and bearing the name of Æpinus, or Hepinus, was in circulation. Bauer, in his work already quoted, places among the works of Æpinus, "Pinacidion de Ecclesiæ Rom. imposturis, adversus impudentem Canonicorum Hamburg autonomiam 1530. Liber rarissimus. Hennings, p. 17." It is worth while to add, that he mentions in the same list another work which does not seem to have been known to Melchior Adam or Simler—at least it is not in their lists—"Liber de Purgatorio, et multi alii ejusdem auctoris tractatus. Lond. 1549. 4. Liber maxime infrequens. Bibl. Solger, ii. p. 169." A copy of this work is also mentioned in the Bibl. Bunav. Tom. III. p. ii. p. 1265. It is surely somewhat remarkable that the only edition of this work that is known at all (while none seems to have been known to countrymen of his own who gave lists of his works) should bear the name of *London* as its birth-place.

[5] Herbert's Ames, vol. ii. p. 970.

Panzer finds not a word to say. We do not hear of so much as a single book *said*, or (what is, indeed, all that he has yet had to offer us since the year 1491) even *supposed* to have been printed at Hamburgh. But after that how does the torrent of typography burst forth! Panzer reports no less than four several and independent works as belonging to that *annus mirabilis* 1536. His statement is as follows;—

"MDXXXVI.

"3. STEPHANI *Wintoniensis Episcopi*, de vera obedientia Oratio. *Cum præfatione Edmundi Boneri*, Archidiaconi Leycestrensis, Sereniss. Reg. Mai. Angliae in Dania Legati, capita notabiliora dictae orationis complectente. In qua etiam ostenditur, causam controversiae, quae inter ipsam Regiam Maiestatem et Episcopum Romanum existit longe aliter ac diversius se habere, quam hactenus a vulgo putatum sit. Hamburgi, 1536. 4.

"*von der Hardt, l. c. II. p.* 194.

"4. Psalmus XLVII. de regno Jesu Christi *doctore Urbano Regio interprete.* Hamburgi, anno 1536. *apud Franc. Rhodum Calendis Septembris* 8.

"*Maitt. Ind. I. p.* 337. *Hirsch. Millen. IV. p.* 58. *Bibl. Schw. iun.*

"5. Psalmus octuagesimus septimus de gloriosa Christi ecclesia D. Joachim. Moller Senatori Hamb. dicatus, *cum commentario D. Urbani Regii. Hamburgi in officina Francisci Rhodi* 1536 *mense Octobri.* 8.

"*Hirsch. Millen. IV. p.* 58. *Bibl. Schw. iun.*

"6. Canticum et Ecclesiastes cum Sect. Bibl. et Psalt. hebr. Occurrunt in Parte II. Machazor germ. *Hamburgi* 1536. *fol.*

"*Cl. De Rossi apparat. Hebraeo-Bibl. p.* 65. *n.* 120. *Masch. Bibl. Sacr. Vol. IV. Suppl. p.* 18."

But magnificent as this statement appears, half of it is disposed of by observing that the first article is the book of Bishop Gardiner, which is the subject of our inquiry; and the fourth is by Panzer's own direction to be expunged. It seems a pity to rob a place which has so little to spare, of the glory of printing a Hebrew book; but if, while such persons as Wolfius and Masch dispute, such another as De Rossi decides that the book was not printed there, but at Augsburgh, what can we do[6]? So there remain only these two commentaries on two Psalms by Urbanus Regius; of which

[6] In his Supplement, (vol. ix. p. 473,) Panzer says, in reference to this matter, "Non Hamburgi sed Augustæ Vindelicorum impressum fuisse hunc librum docet Cl. de Rossi, l. c. p. 37, n. 238. *Deleatur ergo hic.*"

it would be needless to say anything but that the author was a favourite with the English Reformers, and that several of his works (whether any of them were printed at Hamburgh or not) were translated into English, and printed in this country[7]. It will be observed, that these books of Urbanus Regius, like Bishop Gardiner's, are ascribed to the press of Franciscus Rhodus; a printer of whom, as far as I have been able to find, there is no other memorial whatsoever. He is, therefore, a very fit successor to John and Thomas Brocard, and, I suspect, one of the same inscrutable family.

But taking matters as they stand, the history of Hamburgh typography up to, and including, the time when Bishop Gardiner's work is said to have been printed there, is this:—The book of Laudes in 1491—Tyndale's Testament, supposed, 1527—Hepinus's book, supposed, 1530—Gardiner's and two of Urbanus Regius, actually said to be 1536. This is the history as far, at least, as it was known to Panzer. There might be books printed of which he knew nothing; and, on the other hand, books which he supposed to exist, may have been only imaginary. His list for any given city or town may, it is granted, be either defective or redundant, but we must take one with another; and certainly Hamburgh was not so much out of the ken of the Pastor of

[7] It would be tedious to enter into details, but it may be worth while to give one or two extracts from Herbert's Ames. "The Sermon which Christ made on the way to Emaus to those two sorrowfull disciples, set downe in a dialogue by D. Urbane Regius," with "A brefe ingresse to the Christian Reader by John Foxe," printed by John Day, 1578. *Herb.* p. 664. "A Declaration of the twelue articles of the Christen fayth" . . . . "by D. Urbanum Regium, printed by Jugge, 1548." *Herb.* 714. "An Instruccyon of Christen fayth . . . . made by Vrbanus Regius . . . . dedicated by J. Fox the translator, 'to his reuerende and singular good father Ric Melton,'" printed by Hugh Singleton without date. *Herb.* 744. "The olde Learnyng and the new compared together, ... newly corrected and augmented by Wyllyam Turner. Translated from Urban Regius." Printed by Stoughton, 1548. *Herb.* 750. "A lytle Treatise after the maner of an Epistle wryten by the famouse Clerk Doctor Vrbanus Regius," &c., printed by Walter Lynne, 1548. *Herb.* 753. "Solace of Sion, and Joy of Jerusalem," &c., being an exposition on the 87th psalm (that is, the work mentioned in the text) "by Vrbanus Regius: translated by Rich. Robinson." Printed by Richard Jones, 1594. *Herb.* 1049. "A homelie or sermon of the good and euill Angell," &c., by Urbanus Regius, translated by Rich Robinson. Printed by John Charlwood, 1590. *Herb.* 1101.

Nuremberg as many of the places from which he gives much more numerous lists of books printed in the first thirty-six years of the sixteenth century. It would, of course, be absurd to expect from Hamburgh anything like the fecundity of Paris, which furnishes 2839 articles, or of Venice with 1959, or Basil with 1121. Panzer, however, could find at Leipsic, 965; at Lyons, 866; at Cologne, 859; Strasburgh, 808; and (not to speak of places where the numbers are so far beyond all comparison) he found at Cracow 283, and even at Thessalonica, he gleaned more than four times as many as at Hamburgh.[8]

But after so much talk about Bonner's Preface, I cannot help thinking some readers may like to see it. It is not long, and perhaps they may gain some farther ground of opinion from internal evidence. The following is the English translation as it stands in the Roane edition[9]:—

"EDMVND BONER
"Archedeacon of Leicester, the king of England his most excellent maiesties embassadour in Denmarke.
"To the sincere, gentle herted, and godly Reader.

"Forasmuch as ther be som (doubtles) euen at this present, as it hath alwaies bene the wont of mens iudgementes to be variable and diuerse, which thinke, the controuersy that is betwne the kyng of England and of Fraunce his most roial maiestie and the bishop of Rome, consisteth in this point, Because the Kynges said maiestie hath taken the most excellent and most noble lady Anne to his wife: where as in very dede notwithstanding, the matter is far otherwise, and nothing so. Wherfore, to the intent al that truly and heartelye fauour the Gospell of Christ (which that most godly and most vertuous prince, doth with al diligent endeuour, in euery place aduance, to the honour of almightie God, and to the profuyt and commoditie of al christian people) and that are not enemies, but louers of the truth (which euery where iustly claimeth the vpper hand, and to her, althinges, though thei struggle with her neuer so much in the beginning, yet obey and geue place at length as mete it is thei shoulde) mai the more fully vnderstand the chief point of that controuersy, and because thei shal not be ignorant, what the whole voyce and resolute determinacion of the best and greatest

[8] These numbers are taken cursorily from the *first* list of places, without reference to supplemental additions, by which they might have been very considerably increased; which is not the case as it regards Hamburgh.

[9] There are several trifling variations between this and the Rome edition of the preface. But I do not know that there are any of importance.

learned byshops with all the nobles and commons of England is, not onely in that cause of Matrimony, but also in the defending of the gospels doctrine: This Oracion of the bishop of Winchester (a man excellently learned in al kind of learning) entiteled De vera Obedientia, that is, concerning true Obedience, whiche he made lately in England, shal go openly abrode. But as touching this bisshoppes worthi praises, ther shalbe nothing spoken of me at this time: Not onely because thei are infinite, but because they ar far better knowne to all Christendome, than becommeth me here to make rehersal. And as for the Oration itself, which as it is most learned, so is it moost elegaunt, to what purpose should I make any wordes of it, seing it praiseth it selfe inough, and sence good Wine nedeth no tauerne bushe to vtter it. But yet in this Oration, whosoeuer thou art most gentle Reader, thou shalt besides other matters, se it notably and learnedly handeled, of what importannce and how inuincible the power and excellencie of goddes truth is: which as it may nowe and then be pressed of enemies, so it cannot possiblye bee oppressed after such sort, but it commeth again at length behind the scrine, more glorious and more welcome.

"Thou shalt se also touching obedience, that obedience is subiect to truthe, and what is to be iudged true obedience. Besides this of mens tradicions, which for the moost part, are vtterly repungnant against the truth of gods law. And therby the waye, he speaketh of the kynges said highnes Mariage, whiche by the ripe iudgement, authoritie and priuiledge of the most and principal Vniuersities of the world, and than with the consent of the hole church of England, he contracted with the most cleare and most noble ladie quene Anne. After that, touching the kinges maiesties title as pertaining to the supreme head of the church of England. Lastlye of al, of the false pretensed supremacie of the bish. of Rome, in the Realme of England, most iustly abrogated, and howe all other byshopes being felowe like to him in their funccion, yea and in som pointes aboue him also wythin their owne prouinces, wer before tyme bound to him by their oth.

"But be thou most surely persuaded of this good Reader, that the bishop of Rome (though ther wer no cause els but this mariage) wyll easely content himself: specially, hauinge one morsell or other caste him. But whan he seith so mightie a king, being a right vertuous and a great learned prince, so sincerely and so heartelie to fauour the gospell of Christ, and perceiueth the yearly rauenous pray (yea so large a pray, that it came to asmuch almoost as all the kinges reuenewes) snapped out of his handes, and that he could no longer exercise his tiranny in the kinges maiesties realme (alas it hath bene to cruell and bitter al this while) nor make lawes as he hathe done many, to the contumely and reproch of the maiestie of God, which is euident that he hath done in times paste, vnder the title of the catholike churche, and the authoritie of the Apostles Peter and Paul (whan notwithstanding he was a verye rauening wolfe, dressed in shepes clothing, calling himself seruant of seruannts) to the great damage of the christen commen welth: A manne may say there began the mischeif: thereof rose these discordes, these discordes, [*sic*] these deadly malices, and so great

troublous bustlings. For if it were not thus, no man could beleue, that this Jupiter of Olimpus, whiche hath falsely taken vppon him power,[1] wherein is more bragge than hurt, wold haue done his best that this good and godly and righte gospelike prince shold be falsely betraied to all the reast of Monarkes and princes.

"Neither let it moue the (gentle reader) that the B. of Winchestre, did not afore now, applie to this opinion: for he him selfe in this Oration sheweth the cause, why he did it not. And if he hadde saide neuer a word, yet thou knowest well, what a wittie part it is, for a man to suspend his iudgement, and not be to rashe in geuing of sentence. It is an old saying: Mary Magdalen profited vs lesse in her quick belefe that Christ was risen, then Thomas that was longer in doubt. A man maye rightlie cal him Fabius, that wyth his aduised taking of leasure restored the matter to his ful perfection. Albeit I speake not this, as though Winchestre had not boulted out this case secretlie with himself before hand (for he boulted it euen to the branne long ago, out of doubt) but that, running faire and softlie, he would first with his painful studie, plucke the matter oute of the darke, althoughe of it selfe, it was clearelie sound inough, but by reason of sondrie opinions, it was lapped vp and made darke: and then did he debate it wittily to and fro, and so at last (after longe and great deliberation had in the matter) because ther is no better counsailour, then leasure and tyme, he wold resolutelie with his learned and consummate iudgement confirme it[2]. Thou shouldest (gentle Reader) esteme his censure and auctoritye to bee of the more waightie credence, in asmuch as the matter was not rashlie, and at al aduentures, but wyth iudgement (as thou seest) and with wisdome examined and discussed. As for this is no newe example, to be against the b. of Rome: seeinge that not onelie this man, but many men many times, yea and right great learned men afore now, haue done the same euen in writinges: wherin thei both painted him out in his colours, and made his sleightes, falsehead, fraudes, and disceatfull wiles, openlie knowen to the world. Therfore if thou at any time heretofore haue doubted either of true obedience, or of the kinges maiesties mariage, or title, either els of the b. of Romes false pretenced supremaci, as if thou haddest a good smelling nose, and a sound iudgement, I think thou diddest not: yet hauing red ouer this Oration (which if thou fauour

[1] In the original, "hunc Jovem Olympium, qui potestatem plane 'Ανυπεύθυνον sibi falso arrogavit." I have said that Bonner's preface is wanting in the Lambeth copy of the Hamburgh Latin book; and, in order to do as I would be done by, I should add that I have no copy of the original Latin of that preface except what is in Dr. Brown's Fasciculus, and a very beautiful and elaborate MS. copy kindly furnished to me by Mr. Laing. I here follow the latter, which is, I have no doubt, the most correct throughout, though I have not collated it with Dr. Brown's reprint. Certainly it is so in this place, where it reads "ptātē plane *ἀνυπεύθυνον*," which stands in the Fasciculus "pietatem plane 'Ανυπεύθανον," instead of "potestatem."

[2] "quoniam Σύμβουλος *εὔδοξος ἐστι βελτίων χρόνου*, docto et consummato judicio suo comprobare voluerit."

the truth, and hate the tirannie of the bishop of Rome and his deuelish fraudulent falshod, shall doutles wonderfullie content the) throw downe thine errour, and acknowledge the truth now frely offered the at length: considering with thy selfe, that it is better late to do so, than neuer to repent. Fare thou hartelie wel, most gentle reader, and not onelie loue this most valeaunt king of Englande and of Fraunce, who vndoubtedlie was by the prouidence of god born to defend the gospell: but also honour him and with all thy heart serue him moost obediently. As for this Winchestre who was longe ago withoute doubt reputed among the greatest learned men, geue him thy good word with honourable commendations."

On this preface I will here observe only two things. First, that beside the fulsome flattery of Gardiner, and the gross abuse of the pope, (both of which, perhaps, assume rather an exaggerated appearance in this coarse translation), the whole style of the composition is more rhetorical, not to say pedantic, than might have been expected from Bonner. How much Greek the Archdeacon of Leicester carried in his head, or in his portmanteau, when he went on his embassy to Denmark, I cannot tell; but one has not been used to consider him a person from whom one might expect stray sprinkles of it in Latin composition. It is odd, that the very same thing is done by Æpinus at least half-a-dozen times, upon very slight provocation, in his prefatory address to the Marquis Joachim, which I have quoted. Æpinus really was at Hamburgh in 1536, and a good while before and after. Is it possible that Bonner may have taken lessons in composition from him? or is anything else more likely?

Secondly, it is singular that this Preface seems to have been—I was going to say so little known, but that would not express my meaning, for, doubtless, it was well known by those for whom these clandestine books were printed, and among whom they circulated, and I will rather say—so much unknown,—or unknown to *such* persons as those who do in fact seem to have known nothing about it. For instance, its existence is not mentioned in the reprint of Gardiner's Oration by Goldastus, or in the long prefatory matter by which that Oration is introduced, and which is signed by Capito, Hedio, Bucer, and all the other ecclesiastics of Strasburgh. Had they never heard of Bonner's Preface? or did Goldastus know, and omit, a document so much to his purpose? Again, I think that the Preface is never once incidentally hinted at in the Depositions in the

business of Gardiner's deprivation, though the Oration is repeatedly mentioned. There is, I admit, no great weight in this, as the matter there respected strictly only what Gardiner had done; though it would not have been strange if some incidental allusion had been made to the preface. It is of much more importance to observe, (and as far as I can see it is true,) that while Gardiner got into the Prohibitory Index for his part, and his Oration was condemned, Bonner and his Preface escaped all notice; a circumstance, which, if the work was avowed, and believed by well-informed persons to be genuine, seems to me utterly unaccountable.

Add to this, that although, as I have already said, this Preface, genuine or not, was undoubtedly well known among the party for whom books of this kind were secretly printed, yet I recollect only one instance of its being thrown in Bishop Bonner's face by any person under examination. Gardiner got many "nips," both "privy" and apert, for his share in the book; but I do not recollect any other instance of an attack on Bonner than that which was made by William Tyms, curate of Hockley, at his examination on the 28th March, 1556, and it is particularly worthy of attention. How far the reporter was competent to do justice to what he heard, and how much there was which he did not hear, we have no means of knowing, for Fox only tells us, "thus 'much William Aylsbury, witness hereof, being present 'thereat, so far as he heard hath faithfully recorded and 'reported. What more was spoken and there said, (for 'they made not yet an end a good while after,) because he 'departed then out of the house, he doth not know, nor did 'hear." He professed, however, to have heard the following discourse, which, after what we have already seen, may, I think, lead some readers to suspect that Bonner either did not write the Preface in question, or else was a much greater fool than he is generally supposed to have been. He was not in this case (as he was in many others) engaged with merely illiterate persons who might be imposed on, for another of the prisoners was Robert Drakes, "parson of Thundersley, in Essex." If twenty years before, Bonner had written that violent invective in Latin, and if, only two or three years before, two editions of it in English had been circulated, and Bonner not only knew himself that he had

done so, but that the fact was notorious, one can hardly imagine it possible that he should have replied to the general charge of Tyms as he did. Bonner had asked him whether he would submit himself to the Catholic church as an obedient child:—

"Then Tyms answered and said, 'My Lord I doubt not but I am of the catholic church, whatsoever you judge of me. But as for your church, you have before this day renounced it, and by corporal oath promised never to consent to the same. Contrary to the which you have received into this realm the Pope's authority, and therefore you are falsely perjured and forsworn, all the sort of you. Besides this you have both spoken and written very earnestly against that usurped power, and now you do burn men that will not acknowledge the Pope to be supreme head.'[3]

"'HAVE I?' quoth the Bishop; 'WHEN HAVE I WRITTEN ANYTHING AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ROME?'

"'My Lord,' quoth Tyms, 'the Bishop of Winchester wrote a very learned oration, entitled, De vera Obedientia, which containeth worthy matter against the Romish authority. Unto the which book you made a preface, inveighing against the bishop of Rome, reproving his tyranny and falsehood, calling his power false and pretensed. The book is extant, and you cannot deny it.'"

One can easily imagine that the bishop, if he had written the Preface, (and still more, if he had not,) might feel "somewhat abashed" at such a reply. At least he might exhibit such an appearance to a spectator who, perhaps, was fully convinced of the genuineness of the Preface, and the

[3] It is right to state that, according to William Alsbury's own account, it does not appear that Tyms was examined about the pope's supremacy, because such misrepresentations should be pointed out even when they are only incidentally reprinted in passages quoted for quite different purposes. Nobody who has studied the examinations of the martyrs, indeed, would expect to find Bonner taking up that subject, and driving that point, in the first instance. On the contrary, Fox introduces this examination by telling us, that on the five prisoners (of whom Tyms and Drakes were two) being brought before Bonner, "the said Bishop *after his accustomed manner* proceeding against them, inquired of them their faith" [not as to the pope's supremacy, but] "upon the sacrament of the altar. To whom," he adds, "they answered that *the body of Christ* was not in the sacrament of the altar *really* and *corporally* after the words of consecration spoken by the priest." This, I say, is Fox's account of it, but in the course of a page or two, he gives us, "The Articles for the which William Tyms, of Hockley, in Essex, was condemned in the Consistory in Paul's, the 28 day of March; with his Answers and Confession upon the same," and then he gives us, as Tyms's own words: "Item, I confessed that in the sacrament of the altar, the Christ is not present either *spiritually* or *corporally*."

perjured baseness of the bishop. But the candid explanation which Bonner entered into with his prisoners at a public examination in "the open Consistory in Pauls," the modest way in which he proposed himself to them as a model of conscientious prudence—in short, the whole thing, if we can only be sure that there was no irony in it, no sense of the humour of his writing a preface to the "great learned man's" book, none of that broad, and even coarse, humour in which he sometimes indulged at the expense of those who insulted him, and to the amusement of those about him—if one can be quite sure that he said all that is reported, and seriously meant all that he said, the passage is very remarkable indeed. It sets the stubborn old bishop, who had stuck in gaol all the days of King Edward, in quite a new light. What a nice peculiarity of conscience there must have been to prevent his doing for the royal son half what he had done so freely for the royal father! But Fox goes on:—

"Then was the Bishop somewhat abashed, and looking upon such as were present, spake very gently, saying, 'Lo! here is a goodly matter indeed. My Lord of Winchester being a great learned man, did write a book against the Supremacy of the Pope's Holiness, and I also did write a preface before the same book, tending to the same effect. And thus did we because of the perilous world that then was: for then was it made treason by the laws of this realm to maintain the pope's authority, and great danger it was to be suspected a favourer of the see of Rome; and therefore fear compelled us to bear with the time, for otherwise there had been no way but one. You know when any uttered his conscience in maintaining the pope's authority, he suffered death for it.' And then turning his tale unto Tyms, he said, 'But since that time, even since the coming in of the Queens Majesty, when we might be bold to speak our conscience, we have acknowledged our faults, and my Lord of Winchester himself shamed not to recant the same at Paul's Cross. And also thou thyself seest that I stand not in it, but willingly have submitted myself. Do thou also as we have done.'

"'My Lord,' quoth Tyms, 'that which you have written against the supremacy of the pope, may be well approved by the Scriptures. But that which you now do, is against the word of God, as I can well prove.'

"Then another (I suppose it was Dr. Cooke) said, 'Tyms, I pray thee let me talk with thee a little,' &c."—*Fox*, viii. 10.

I do not pretend to say that others may not have made reference to this Preface, when under examination by Bonner; but as I have stated, this is the only instance which I have observed, though I believe I may say that I have examined

every case in which Bonner had to do with any accused person. Bishop Gardiner's conduct with respect to his part of the work was very different, as the reader will perceive.

ESSAY XIX.

GARDINER'S POPERY.

IT may at first be difficult for some readers, but perhaps on reflection they will find it possible, to imagine a man ardently denying the Supremacy of the Pope, and avowing a zealous desire to abolish his usurped authority, and yet at the same time strenuously maintaining Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Invocation of the Saints, and a variety of other doctrines and practices which the adherents to the Pope maintain, but which protestants have rejected. Such men, however, there were among those who lived in, and survived, the reign of Henry the Eighth; and Bishop Gardiner was one of them. When the person of the king had changed, and Edward was on the throne, Gardiner not only avowed that he had in the former reign maintained the King's Supremacy, but he still maintained it, and in the process for his deprivation before Edward's Commissioners, he pleaded in his "Long Matter," which has been already quoted, that the articles brought forward against him ought not to have any weight, for various reasons:—

"And, among other things, because the said bishop hath been always ready, with his best endeavour, diligence, and industry, according to his bounden duty, to publish, declare, and set forth, as well *the supremacy, and supreme authority, of the king's majesty that now is, and of the most noble prince of famous memory, the king's majesty's father that dead is, as the abolishing of the usurped power of the bishop of Rome*, and setting forth of all and singular acts, statutes, laws, injunctions, and proclamations, made and ordained in that behalf, and concerning orders of religion in this his majesty's church of England; and hath had, hitherto, a very circumspect, learned, and diligent chancellor under him, who hath duly executed, and put in execution, the same accordingly: all which things the said bishop, for his own part, hath likewise always justly, duly, and obediently done, kept, observed, and executed, and for the approving, confirming, and stablishing the said supremacy. And of the usurped

power of the bishop of Rome aforesaid, he hath not only openly preached, affirmed, and declared the same, in many and divers his sermons (preaching and teaching always due obedience), but also hath made and set forth *a certain book or work concerning the same*, as by the contents thereof more plainly appeareth, and hath defended the same in the university of Louvain. And these things were and be true, public, notorious, manifest, and famous."—*Fox*, Vol. vi. p. 105.

Bishop Gardiner, it is plain, was not anxious to conceal or disavow, in the reign of King Edward, what he was said to have written to curry favour with King Henry; and it is somewhat curious to see how this one of his Articles is treated by some of those who were called upon to depose in reply to the multitude of them contained in his "Long Matter." A considerable portion of those who were interrogated, were, it will be seen, in a state of remarkable ignorance concerning the book.

"The Right honourable Lord Edward Duke of Somerset, being examined upon the articles ensuing, saith as followeth:—

"To the 1st article his Grace saith that it hath oftentimes appeared to his Grace, by sundry complaints and informations made against the said bishop, that he hath not done his duty in setting forth the King's Majesty's proceedings, in matters of religion, in such ample sort as his duty required. And as for his chancellor, his Grace can little testify therein otherwise than that there hath been of late in him no towardness of conformity; for which he doth now remain in prison. And his Grace, also, saith, that touching the bishop's preaching against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, he remembereth not of any sermon by him so made, saving one, whereof fuller mention is made in his depositions upon the articles, ministered against the said bishop of office in this behalf. And as for the book mentioned in this article, his Grace saith, he *hath heard* of such a book by him made; but to what effect it weigheth, *his grace knoweth not*, nor also of his defence made in the university of Louvain."—*Fox*, Vol. vi. p. 168.

It was hardly to be expected that the minor courtiers of King Edward should be better informed than his Grace the Lord Protector. Perhaps it was only a proper compliment to his station to profess a still more complete ignorance. Turning over the depositions, we find that,

"As for the bishop's book, and his disputation in Louvain, mentioned in this article, his lordship [the Earl of Wiltshire] knoweth *nothing* of it," p. 171,—absolutely nothing.

"As touching the said bishop's book, and disputation in Louvain, his Lordship [the Marquis of Northampton] knoweth *nothing* thereof," p. 173.

"This deponent [the Lord Chancellor Riche] hath *heard say* (of whom *he remembereth not*) that the said bishop did set forth a book in maintenance of supremacy to be in the king that dead is, his heirs and successors. And otherwise he cannot depose," p. 175.

The Earl of Warwick passed the matter by, without mention, p. 177.

"Touching the book made by the said bishop and his disputations at Louvain, they are *unknown* to his lordship," [the Earl of Bedford,] p. 180.

"What book or work the said bishop hath set forth against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, or defence he made in the university of Louvain, this examinate [Sir William Harbert] *knoweth not*," p. 182.

Sir John Baker passed over the matter of the book entirely; and, indeed, he could say but little about the bishop's opinions on any subject, "for he never heard him preach but one sermon, the which was at St. Mary Overys before the house was suppressed. And whether he treated of such matter, yea or no, he doth not remember," p. 184.

"He [Sir Edward Carne] *heard say*, that the said bishop did make a book for the king's supremacy, and against the bishop of Rome's authority. And further this deponent saith, that he, being ambassador in Flanders, *heard say* that the said bishop of Winchester, going in an ambassade to the emperor of Germany through Louvain, communing with certain learned men, there offered to dispute openly touching the defence of the said book, upon occasion ministered by the said learned men against the said bishop, touching the said book. And otherwise he cannot depose;" though he added, when examined upon the Interrogatories, that "he heard a talk at the time the said bishop of Winchester made the book afore deposed of, that he was loth to write against the said bishop of Rome; but, whether the talk was true he cannot tell."—p. 185.

It could not be denied, even by Gardiner's bitterest and least scrupulous enemies, that there was a sort of hearsay—a blind rumour—abroad, that Bishop Gardiner had once written some book, about something, though they did not know what. How strange that a work by such a person, on such a subject, at such a time, should have fallen still-born from the press of the king's printer—to say nothing of its being (if it was) caught up and puffed and prefaced by the zealous Bonner, and reprinted at Hamburgh and at Strasburgh! How very odd that so many and such persons should have known so little about it! One might almost imagine that the whole thing was an imposture, if we had not Bishop Gardiner's own acknowledgment, and the testimony of credible witnesses to support it. For some of those who were examined knew, or professed to know, more about it than the Lord Protector and his friends. "Cuthbert

[Tonstal] Bishop of Durham, one of the king's most honourable privy council, of the age of 76," deposed that—

"In the king's time that dead is, the said bishop, as one of the Council, did set forth for his part all such articles, statutes, injunctions, and proclamations, as were then decreed and determined; and did set forth at all times the same accordingly. And deposeth further, that the said bishop *did make a book against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome*, and setting forth the king's supremacy; which book this deponent hath seen; and all the premises before deposed, he saith, are true, notorious, and manifest *to them that were of the Council at that time*."—p. 189.

We may presume that the Bishop of Durham was not aware of some of the declarations which have just been quoted from the examinations of deponents who "were of the Council at *that* time," and who were "of the Council" at *this* time also, as they meant to show.

"Thomas [Thirlby] Bishop of Norwich, of the age of 47 or thereabouts," deposed that—

"Although the said Bishop of Winchester (very loth to condescend to any innovations) was earnest against alterations, as well concerning the bishop of Rome as other orders in Religion, yet after those matters were established and set forth, by the acts, statutes, and laws of this realm, and the king's majesty's injunctions and proclamations, this deponent hath known and heard the bishop of Winchester publish, declare, and set forth, as well the supremacy or supreme authority of the king's majesty's father of famous memory, as the abolishing of the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, accordingly as he was bound: and *did set forth a book concerning the same*, as by the contents thereof may appear, which this deponent hath heard. But how the said bishop of Winchester and his Chancellor (whom this deponent hath of long time known to be wise and learned) have executed in his diocese, the king's majesty's injunctions and proclamations, he knoweth not; for he hath not been conversant there. Which things, before by this deponent deposed, be true, notorious, manifest, public, and famous. And as touching the defence of the bishop's book at Louvain, he hath heard reported, that he offered to defend the said book then and there; and before certain of the doctors, did defend the same, as he heard say."—p. 190.

"John Pottinger of Winchester, gentleman, where he hath continued these ten years, of the age of 36; sworn and examined," deposed—

"That the said bishop *hath set forth a book* in Latin, many years since, entituled 'De Vera Obedientia,' wherein the said bishop set forth the king's supremacy, as he remembereth; and treated against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, and of obedience of the subjects to their prince, as supreme head, very earnestly, to this deponent's remembrance. For this deponent hath seen and read the

book, and in the same did read of the premises. And, examined whether he understandeth the Latin tongue, he saith, yea; and that once he was fellow of New College in Oxford, and hath the same book at this present in his study."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 217.

"Master John White, Warden of the college of Winchester, of the age of 40," being sworn and examined, among other things "deposeth as followeth:"

"All the contents of this article, touching as well the bishop as his chancellor, are true, to this deponent's certain knowledge, saving the defence of the said bishop's book at Louvain; which book the said bishop (as this deponent hath heard say of certain learned men being then with the bishop) did defend against the rector and certain divines of the university of Louvain; which book that he so defended (as it was said) was the book made by the bishop 'De Vera Obedientia,' and that book this deponent hath seen and read, which entreateth of the king's supremacy, and the abolishment of the bishop of Rome's authority. And saith, that all the premises, saving the defence of the said book, are notorious, manifest, and famous, within the diocese of Winchester, to this deponent's certain hearing and knowledge.

"And for further declaration, this deponent saith, that about twelve years ago, or thereabouts, as he doth remember, this deponent (then being schoolmaster of the college of Winton) did by the commandment of the bishop of Winchester, make certain verses extolling the king's supremacy, and against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome; which said verses this deponent caused his scholars to learn, and to practise them in making of verses to the like argument; the said bishop encouraging this deponent so to do."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 223.

One would be glad to have a fuller account of Bishop Gardiner's proceedings at Louvain in reference to his book; and no doubt materials are in existence, though I have it not in my power at present to avail myself of them. I know of only two other documents, preserved in Fox's Martyrology, which tend to throw light on the matter. They add indeed very little to our knowledge, though they are not without interest in several points of view. The first is the deposition of "Master William Medowe, clerk, chaplain to the 'bishop of Winchester, and master of the hospital of Holy 'Crosses, beside Winchester; of the age of 60 years," which begins in the following manner:—

"To the first article of the matter this deponent saith, that the space of this twenty years he hath been with the said bishop of Winchester, and is his chaplain, and all the said space, he saith, that the said bishop, to this deponent's sight and knowledge, hath always set forth, to the uttermost of his power, the king's supremacy, and the abolishment of the bishop of Rome's authority. And saith, that at five several times he hath attended upon the said bishop,

when he was sent beyond the seas for ambassador, as well to the emperor, as to the French king; at one of which times, the said bishop was at Louvain, when there was a commencement, wherein proceeded two doctors of physic; at which said commencement, the said bishop was desired to be the Father of the Act, and was at the same Act present.

"And after the said Act done, in the selfsame day, after dinner, the rector of the university accompanied with four or five learned men, came to the said bishop, to his house. And, there and then, the rector brought with him the book, which the said bishop had set forth, concerning the supremacy of the king's majesty, and the abolishment of the bishop of Rome's authority; with the which book, the said rector, and the other persons, were offended, and came to the said bishop, to see what he could speak for the defence of the said book. Unto whom the said bishop said, that he would gladly hear what they could object against it, and he would make them answer. And thereupon, the said bishop, with the said rector, and the other persons, went unto his chamber, and there continued in disputation; wherein this deponent heard the said bishop very earnest and loud in the defence of the said book; which said book, this deponent saith, he hath seen and read, and was in the house with the said bishop, when he did make the same book.

"And further he saith, that the said bishop, within his diocese, hath set forth all such acts, statutes, injunctions, and proclamations, as have been made and set forth by the king's majesty that dead is, and the king's majesty that now is.

"And further saith, that for the setting forth of the same, he hath had an expert chancellor, Dr. Steward, who hath caused the same accordingly to be set forth within the diocese, and specially within the city of Winchester, and within the hospital of the Holy Crosses, whereof this deponent is master; and for such a man, the said chancellor hath been and is commonly reputed and taken, within the diocese of Winchester, to this deponent's knowledge.

"And saith, that the said bishop, at divers and many of his said sermons whereat this deponent hath been present, hath set forth the king's majesty's supremacy, and the abolishment of the bishop of Rome's authority.

"And otherwise he cannot depose upon the statutes of the said article."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 202.

The second is "a Letter written from Louvain by one Francis Driander, the contents whereof," says Fox, "are hereunder expressed in Latin as he wrote it, and the English whereof, as much as to the present purpose appertaineth, here followeth translated;" and for us it will be enough to extract the English translation, without criticising it, and only premising that the letter was dated September 22, 1541, and addressed to Edmund Crispin, a person of whom I believe little or nothing is known, except what is to be learned from Anthony a Wood's not very complimentary

notice of him[1]. But the value of the letter arises from its having been put in as evidence by Bishop Gardiner himself, during the process for his deprivation.

"Before my departure from the city of Paris, I wrote unto you by our friend the englishman, &c. Now the narration of your bishop of Winchester, shall satisfy and content you. He (the said bishop) as appertained to the ambassador of so noble a prince, came to Louvain with a great rout and bravery, and was there, at a private man's house called Jeremy's, most honourably entertained and received; where the faculty of divines, for honour's sake, presented him wine in the name of the whole university. But our famous doctors, and learned masters, for that they would more deeply search and understand the learning and excellency of the prelate, perused and scanned a certain Oration made by him, and now extant, intitled 'De vera Obedientia,' which is as much as to say, in our english tongue, 'Of true Obedience,' in the which his Oration he did greatly impair and subvert the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, and preferred his Lord and King's authority before the holy apostolic see as they were wont to term it: which being read and considered by them, they did not only repent them, for attributing such their honour unto him, but also recanted what they had done before; and, like impudent persons, did not so much honour him afore, but now twice so much with many obloquies and derisions, disabled and dishonoured his person.

"But, in conclusion, Richard Lathomus interpreter of the Terms, with the favourers of this fraternity, and other the champions of the falling church, boldly enterprised to dispute with him concerning the pope's supremacy. The Bishop stoutly defended his said Oration. The divines contrary did stiffly maintain their opinion, and, divers times openly with exclamation, called the said bishop an excommunicate person, and a schismatic; to the no little reproach and infamy of the english nation.

"I will not here repeat the arguments and reasons which were alledged on both parts, for the defence of the opinions of each side, for that lest, perhaps, to learned men, they shall not seem all of the strongest; and also, because it becometh me to save and preserve the estimation of either party. The bishop not long after, minding to say mass in St. Peter's church, they did deny unto him, as to an excommunicate person, the ornaments and vestments meet for the same; wherewith being highly offended, he suddenly hasted his

[1] Under the year 1547 he tells us that "Edmund Crispyne of Oriell coll. lately a shagling lecturer of physic, now one of the proctors of the university, did supplicate to be licensed to proceed in physic," and he adds, that though he found no registration of their license he has no doubt that it was granted, as he found the supplicant afterwards "written and stiled" a doctor of physic. *Fast. Ox.* Part I. col. 126. One would like to know how the letter came into Gardiner's possession. Strype seems to take it for granted that this Crispin was the divine of the "popish stamp" bearing that name, whose services the Devonshire rebels required in the year 1548.—*Cran.*, vol. i. 265.

journey from thence. The dean the next day after, made an eloquent oration, wherein he openly disgraced and defamed his person. I lament greatly their case, who so rashly, without any advisement, gave themselves to be mocked among grave and witty men. You have heard now a true story for our doctor was the chief and principal doer of that tragedy."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 139.

We may just observe, that in all this, (written several years after the supposed publication at Hamburgh,) there is not a word of Bishop Bonner or his Preface; nor do I recollect that, when he was in circumstances somewhat similar to those of Gardiner, he made any such claim as Gardiner now did, and as he had quite an equal right to make if the Preface was his. If, however, it be said that we ought not to expect anything about Bonner's part of the book in the process relating to Gardiner, it must still be allowed that it would not have been surprising if some word about it had escaped; and that if Gardiner believed himself to be indebted to Bonner for such fervent co-operation and patronage, it was ungrateful in him to pass by so fair an occasion of mentioning it, when it might have been of service to his fellow-sufferer.

But enough has, perhaps, been said to convince the reader that if Gardiner did write the Oration, he had no inconsistency or tergiversation to be ashamed of; and that whether the author of the Preface deserved praise or blame for his work, was a question that in no way touched Bishop Bonner.

ESSAY XX.

BONNER'S CRUELTY.

§ 1. GENERAL STATEMENTS AND FULLER'S IN PARTICULAR.

THE character of Bonner for cruelty is so established, that it is superfluous to collect testimonies from the various writers by whom the charge has been brought; especially considering what I have already had occasion to quote in the course of these Essays[1].

[1] See what is quoted before from Bale, p. 40; from Ponet, p. 57; and from Traheron, p. 65. After them it is almost needless to quote Burnet, Strype, or even Fox, much less Fuller, Heylin, and more modern writers.

Indeed, these charges have been so often, and so vehemently repeated, and have so passed into a proverb, that it is much less necessary to prove their existence, or exhibit their nature, than to deprecate the appearance of maintaining a paradox by suggesting the idea that they are gross exaggerations, and in a very great degree false, and slanderous.

As, however, I do not see that I can be suspected of any partial motive, in wishing to illustrate this part of our ecclesiastical history, and as my conscience acquits me of all sympathy with any person of whatever party or name (Cranmer, Calvin, or Bonner) in so far as he thought of maintaining or enforcing Christianity by fire and faggot, I shall not dilate on this point; but in order to come to an immediate understanding with the reader, I will at once say, that I not only believe those contemporary writers whom I have quoted, as well as some others, to have indulged in rhodomontade declamation, and in scurrility as odious for its falsehood as for its coarseness; but that I believe their coloured and exaggerated accounts of *facts* to have been still farther coloured and exaggerated—I will add, perverted and falsified—by more modern copyists. I do not say that it has been done in most cases with bad purpose, or in all even knowingly; I only state my belief that it has, in fact, been done; and that stories have been handed from one careless writer to another, containing monstrous falsehoods, even beyond what might be warranted by the statements of the most loose and declamatory writers of the time. I will give a specimen from one of our most respectable ecclesiastical historians, which will not only explain my meaning, but form a very suitable introduction to what I wish further to state.

Fuller, in his Church History, gives an account of the Marian persecution, which he divides according to Dioceses; and after stating what occurred in several of them he proceeds:—

"Cross we the Thames to come into Middlesex, and Essex, the Diocese of London under Bishop Bonner, whom all generations shall call Bloody. St. Paul mentioneth his fighting with Beasts at Ephesus after the manner of men, which some expound, his encountering with people, men for their shape and sex; but beasts for their cruell mindes, and manners. In the same sense we may say, that Lion, Tiger, Wolfe, Bear; yea, a whole forest of wilde beasts met in

Bonner, killing two hundred in the compasse of three yeers. And, as if his cruelty had made him Metropolitan of all England, he stood not on distinction of Dioceses, but martyred all, wheresoever he met them. Thus Mr. Philpot belonged to Gardiner's Jurisdiction, and often pleaded in vain, that Bonner was none of his Ordinary, yet Bonner (Ordinary, or Extraordinary) dispatch'd him, who cared not whence men came but onely whither he sent them. No sex, quality, or age, escap'd him, whose fury reached from John Fetty a lad of eight yeers old, by him scourged to death; even unto Hugh Laverock, a Creeple, sixty eight yeers old, whom he caused to be burnt."—*Ch. Hist.* Book VIII. p. 18.

Now, as to the forest of wild beasts one hardly knows what to say; it is scarcely tangible; but I may be allowed to suggest that if a whole forest of wild beasts, ranging among a crowd of defenceless sheep, devoured only two hundred in three years, they must have been, for wild beasts, rather moderate in their food. But let this stand by till we have looked at more specific statements.

In the first place it must not be passed over—for the greatness of the number, and the shortness of the time, are the points intended to impress the reader—that it would have been more fair to have said three years *and three quarters;* for there was as much of a fourth year as elapsed between the 4th of February and the 10th of November. Again as to the number; I have no idea why Fuller says that Bonner killed "two hundred." If he means the whole number who suffered, that was considerably greater; and it would have been better for his reputation if he had stuck to the old lie, which he might have put off on Fox, without at all risking his own credit;—

> "This cannibal, in three years space, three hundred martyrs slew,
> They were his food; he loved so blood; he SPARED NONE he knew."[2]

There is, however, something in this half-hearted modesty of Fuller which places him in an awkward position; for as the magnitude of falsehoods is not calculated by the laws of aritbmetical progression, it is almost as bad to talk of *two* hundred as of *three.* I know of no authority but his own caprice for assigning to Bonner this lion's share of the prey. He had enough to render exaggeration perfectly gratuitous. Hume states (I believe quite correctly, I am sure he is not

[2] Fox, vol. viii. p. 482.

far wrong) that the cases of martyrdom which occurred during the whole of Mary's reign amounted to 277. If anybody can show that Bonner had anything to do, directly or indirectly, with more than about 120 I shall wonder. Some reader may say "Was it not bad enough to kill 120 in three years and three quarters?" But I beg him to observe that I have not made any such admission; and that when I speak of Bonner's having "anything to do" with a case of martyrdom, I wish my words to be taken as strictly as possible. For instance, no reasonable person would think of saying that Bonner had anything to do with the martyrdom of Cranmer; yet I include that case in the number of those with which he was concerned, simply because he was one of the bishops who went by a special commission to Oxford to perform the ceremony of degrading the Archbishop.

But this will be clearer presently;—to proceed with Fuller:—he tells us that Bonner took upon him as if he had been metropolitan of all England, "and that he stood not on distinction of dioceses, but martyred all, wheresoever he met them." I believe this to be absolutely and entirely untrue. A caviller might say, though I believe it is the only case in which he could say anything of the kind, that when Bonner went, by special commission, to Oxford to perform the ceremony of degrading Cranmer, he "met" him out of his own diocese. But except this (which is no real exception) I suspect it would be impossible to name a case in which Bonner martyred, or examined, or meddled with anybody whatever, except upon the particular ground, distinctly stated in articles officially ministered, that the prisoner had been "met" in the Bishop of London's diocese, and was under his jurisdiction; and further that it was on this ground, and by virtue of this jurisdiction, that the bishop was interfering in the business.

Moreover, I know of only one case in which that claim grounded on diocese and jurisdiction was questioned by a prisoner; and that is the very one of Philpot which Fuller quotes; but which is so far from giving colour to his statement, that it most clearly exposes its gross falsehood. Philpot, in the course of an examination, said that he had not offended my Lord of London, and asked why he should be called before him. Bonner (according to Philpot's own account of the matter) did not answer by roaring like a

forest of wild beasts, or by pretending to be a metropolitan, but soberly and articulately replied "Yes, I have to lay to your 'charge that you have offended *in my diocese*, by speaking 'against the blessed sacrament of the altar; and *therefore* I 'may call you, and proceed against you, to punish you by 'the law." To this Philpot says he answered, "I have not 'offended in your diocese: for that which I spake of the 'sacrament was in Paul's Church in the Convocation house, 'which (as I understand) is a peculiar jurisdiction, belonging 'to the dean of Paul's, and therefore is counted *of* your 'lordship's diocese, but not *in* your diocese." This seems to have been new light to Bonner, who exclaimed "Is not Paul's Church in my diocese? well I wot it costeth me a good deal of money by the year, the leading thereof." It is not to our purpose to enter into this dispute, which was repeatedly renewed between the parties; but I will add in a note one specimen which may be enough to show, that Bonner did not take upon him to examine Philpot either as a wild beast, or a metropolitan, but (whether right or wrong in fact or in law) simply on the ground of jurisdiction in his own particular Diocese[3].

[3] Fox, vii. 614. The passage quoted in the text occurred at Philpot's fourth examination. The subject had been repeatedly discussed before, and was touched on again at his fifth, *Ibid.* 620; resumed in his seventh, *Ibid.* 639; again in a private conference with Bonner, *Ibid.* 646; and perhaps on other occasions; but by the tenth the Bishop seems to have got rather tired of it, and the following conversation is reported to have taken place. The first speaker was one of "two homely gentlemen" unknown to Philpot, who happened to be present, and seems to have said nothing but what is here recorded.

"*Gentleman.* Why do you not require absolution at my lord's hands 'here now?

"*Philpot.* Because he is not mine ordinary, neither hath by the law 'any thing to do with me of right.

"*London.* What an obstinate fool is this! I tell thee, I will be thine 'ordinary, whether thou wilt or no.

"*Philpot.* And because of this your unrighteous force towards me, 'I have appealed from you, and require you, master registrar, that my 'appeal may be entered in writing.

"*London.* Have you heard such a froward fellow as this? he seemed 'yesterday to be very tractable, and I had a good hope of him. I tell 'thee, thou art of my diocese.

"*Philpot.* I am of Winchester diocese, and not of London diocese.

"*London.* I pray you, may not a man be of two dioceses at once?

"*Philpot.* No, that he cannot.

"*London.* Lo, will you see what an ignorant fool this is in the law, in

But in dealing with such a story can no one help remarking that it is rather strange, and like the absurdity into which party writers are apt to be led, to ask our sympathy, and try to move our feelings, in behalf of a poor pious puritan who "pleaded in vain" to be put into the hands of Gardiner? Will it not be thought maudlin nonsense even by readers, who only know Fox's reports of Philpot's "boldness" in the days of King Edward, and his "divers conflicts with Gardiner the bishop in the city of Winchester"—by those who have never been particularly informed that "Stephen, bishop of Winton, ever bare ill-will against this godly gentleman," and who have never seen the humourous "passage Mr. Sternhold, one of King Edward's Privy Chamber, told afterwards to that King for entertainment's sake;" namely, how the said bishop of Winchester (in our story the defrauded Ordinary) sent for Philpot to meet certain justices at his house, and called him "rogue," and then finding that he could dispend ten pounds by the year, and was his own nephew's landlord, "was afraid and ashamed for making so loud a lie upon a gentleman, and a learned gentleman."[4] Whether this account of Strype's is verbatim the Old Version of our good Psalmist, I do not know, or how far it is true, but it leads one to think that there was no particular cruelty in keeping Philpot out of Gardiner's hands. Indeed I think one hint was dropped by Bonner at a later period, which seems to look quite a contrary way. If I remember right, he suggested that Philpot had been emboldened to imagine that he should

'the which he would seem to be seen? I tell thee, a man may be of 'three dioceses at once: as if thou wert born in London, by reason 'thereof thou should be of my diocese: or else if thou wert not born 'here, but hadst a dignity, also thou art to be counted of my diocese: or 'else by reason of thy habitation in my diocese.

"*Philpot.* In none of these respects I am of your lordship's diocese; but for all that, this will not follow, that I, dwelling at Winchester, am 'at that present of London diocese.

"*London.* What wilt thou lay thereof? wilt thou recant, if I prove it?

"*Philpot.* But what shall I win, if you do not?

"*London.* I will give thee my bishopric, if I prove it not.

"*Philpot.* Yea, but who shall deliver it me, if I win?

"*London.* Thou art an arrogant fool. Enter their oaths, and take 'these witnesses' depositions. I must be gone to the parliament-'house."—*Ibid.* p. 655.

[4] Strype, Mem. III. i. 438.

escape burning through the death of Gardiner. But perhaps enough has been said of this case; only I must beg the reader to reflect on the almost incredible assurance of bringing it forward with a "THUS" as if it were given off hand, and by chance, as the first that came to recollection from among scores or hundreds, to prove that Bonner "stood not on distinction of Dioceses, but martyred all wheresoever he met them."

One remark, however, I must add on the phraseology in which this falsehood is expressed, because words have their nods and winks, and frequently exercise a strong, though subtle influence on readers, even when the objection to them is such as seems at first sight to be nothing more than cavil or petty criticism. Fuller says he martyred all "wheresoever he *met* them." Now I have already stated that the "wheresoever" was, without any real exception that I know of, within his own diocese and jurisdiction; but, beside this, there is something implied in the word "met," which is not applicable to the real circumstances of the case. When bodies are said to be "met," it is implied that the meeting body, at least, was in motion; we should hardly think of saying that a man "met" a post, unless he ran against it; and, at all events, we should not use such a word to describe his contact with a body thrown in his face, or into his lap, by an external force. Fuller's language would naturally convey, and of course he meant it to convey, the idea, that Bonner was on the look out, and went forth, and prowled like a wild beast to seek his prey. That he desired to meet with heretics, and catch them, and kill them. What ground he might have for the suggestion I know not; but I must say that from all that I have hitherto learned I am inclined to believe that Bonner never either by himself, or his agents, searched for heretics, or was the original cause of any man's being brought into trouble on the score of religion, except so far as he might be said to be so by the effect of official documents set forth by him in his character of a Bishop or an Ecclesiastical Judge. Or to put the matter in another form,—what I see leads me to doubt whether he ever imprisoned, or examined, or even took cognizance of the existence of any suspected individual on the accusation of any informer, spy, or private individual, or even on the reports which he officially monished his clergy to make (and

which I presume they did make) to him of those who refused to go to church, to confess, to communicate, &c. I cannot prove this (and further inquiry may produce some cases to show I am mistaken), but I believe that he never dealt with any alleged heretic who was not brought before him in his official character as Bishop of London, in due course of law, by the warrant of some magistrate, or other person, acting directly under a Commission from the Government.

These points will appear more clearly hereafter. In the mean time I am afraid the humane reader will think that I am postponing, and shrinking from, and not daring to confront, the most shocking part of Fuller's account. What are we to say to the general statement that, "No sex, quality, or age escap'd him"? and the particular cases of "John Fetty a lad of eight years old, by him scourged to death," and "Hugh Laverock a Creeple, sixty-eight years old, whom he caused to be burnt"?

As to the first part of this it is obviously mere declamation. One knows perfectly, and is tired of being told over and over again, that the law for burning heretics was a very bad law; and ought never to have existed. But, in fact, it did exist, and it was the law of the country; and did anybody ever hear of a country where there were laws and judges, and where either sex or quality, or age, was considered as a legitimate ground of escape from the penalty of the law? Has any nation ever tried the experiment? Does anybody wish to have it tried? If they do let them say so.

To come then to the consideration of John Fetty in particular. I do not wish to say what is harsh or coarse, and therefore I will abstain from using some of the words which I have just quoted from our venerable Psalmist's narrative, though they run in my mind; and I really do hope that if his own book, and Fox's had been held up before Fuller's eyes, he would have been "afraid and ashamed for making" such an unfair use of his authority. If merely the truth of the story were in controversy, instead of the more serious question of the credit and respect due to the historian, it would be sufficient to reply that Fox does not venture to say as a matter of fact,—no, nor even as a matter of his own belief,—either that the child *was*

scourged to death; or that, if he was, Bonner ever so much as saw him.

But as I do not expect the reader either to take my word for this, or to study the history in Fox, and as it is highly illustrative of several of the points touched upon in this volume, I will give what I believe to be a true, though a brief, summary of the story.

John Fetty, the father of the child in question, was a simple and godly poor man, "dwelling in the parish of Clerkenwell, and was by vocation a taylor, of the age of twenty-four years or thereabout." He seems to have married at an age when he could not be expected to show much discretion in choosing a partner; for this (not his only, and perhaps not his eldest) child was "of the age of eight or nine years." He suffered for his youthful indiscretion; for his wife, disapproving his resolution "not to come into the church, and be partaker of their idolatry and superstition," was so cruel, or so zealous, as to denounce him to "one Brokenbury, a priest and parson of the same parish." Accordingly "through the said priest's procurement, he was apprehended by Richard Tanner, and his fellow constables there, and one Martin the headborough." Immediately after doing this the poor woman was seized with such remorse that she became "distract of her wits." Even the pitiless papists were moved; the Baalamite priest and the constables, and headborough, all agreed for the sake of her, and her two children, that they would "for that present 'let her husband alone, and would not carry him to prison, 'but yet suffered him to remain quietly in his own house; 'during which time, he, as it were forgetting the wicked 'and unkind fact of his wife, did yet so cherish and provide 'for her, that within the space of three weeks (through 'God's merciful providence) she was well amended, and had 'recovered again some stay of her wits and senses."[5]

But strange to say, "so soon as she had recovered some health," her cruelty or zeal revived, and she "did again accuse her husband." The steps are not stated; but we may reasonably suppose them to have been the same as before. Now, however, as there was nothing to interrupt the common course of things, John Fetty was "carried unto

[5] Fox, viii. 511.

'Sir John Mordant, Knight, one of the Queen's Commis-
'sioners, and he upon examination sent him by Cluny the
'bishop's sumner, unto the Lollards' Tower." On what charge (except so far as may be gathered from what has been already stated) Sir John sent him to prison we are not told; but there he lay for fifteen days, and probably Bonner knew no more of his being there, than he knew of Thomas Green's being twice as long in his own coal-house[6].

Perhaps while her husband lay in prison, the poor woman, who may so peculiarly be termed the wife of his youth, relented, and thought herself happy that, owing to their early marriage, they had already a child of an age to traverse the streets of London, of "a bold and quick spirit," who would make his way in search of his father; and at the same time, "godly brought up," and knowing how to behave himself before his elders and betters at the bishop's palace. I own, however, that this is mere supposition, and that I find no particular ground for supposing that his mother knew that he was gone out upon what may have been only a spontaneous pilgrimage of filial piety; but, to come to facts, it is clearly stated that he "came unto the bishop's 'house to see if he could get leave to speak with his father. 'At his coming thither one of the bishop's chaplains met 'with him, and asked him what he lacked, and what he 'would have. The child answered, that he came to see his 'father. The chaplain asked again who was his father. 'The boy then told him, and pointing towards Lollards' 'Tower, showed him that his father was there in prison. ''Why,' quoth the priest, 'thy father is a heretic.' The 'child being of a bold quick spirit, and also godly brought 'up, and instructed by his father in the knowledge of God, 'answered and said, 'My father is no heretic; for you have 'BALAAM'S MARK.'"

By this notable speech the unhappy child has gained a place in the holy army of martyrs. At least (so far as Fox tells us) he said and did nothing else; though perhaps we may take it for granted that the precocious little polemic showed his "bold and quick spirit," and his godly bringing up, in some other smart sayings, and gave some other

[6] See before, p. 19.

"privy nips" to the Balaamite priest, such as Bishop Christopherson and Miles Hoggard would not have approved[7], before he got the whipping, which he is said to have received ere he reached his father in the Lollards' Tower. For "the priest took the child by the hand, and led him into the bishop's house," says Fox; and he adds, with the absurdity which so often, and so happily neutralizes his malice, "whether to the bishop or not I know not, but *like enough he did.*" "Like enough"—is that all? and is there the least likelihood of such a thing? especially when Fox proceeds to state that the child as soon as he had been whipped was taken to his father in the tower, and fell on his knees and told him his pitiful story, how "a priest with Balaam's mark took him into the bishop's house, and there was he so handled;" but not a word did the child say of ever seeing the bishop. Fox himself dared not put more in his marginal note than "The miserable tyranny of *the papists* in scourging a child."

The historian, however, tells us that they detained the boy (whom they probably considered as a go-between) for three days; and at the end of that time Bonner makes his first appearance in the story. And then we are introduced to him, not burning heretics, but "basting of himself against a great fire" in his bed-room. There is nothing to show that he had ever before heard of either John Fetty or his child; but on that occasion the father (and as far as appears the father only) was brought before him. He quickly showed by his conduct and discourse that he was either a sort of half-witted person, or else that finding himself in awkward circumstances he wished to pass for one. In that character, whether natural or artificial, he talked some sad nonsense and impertinence to the Bishop, who having, of course, gone through the necessary preliminaries of being in a "*marvellous rage*" and a "*great fury*," and then again being in "fear of the law for murdering a child,"

[7] See before, pp. 232, 234. The story of this poor little fellow, a martyr (if at all) to the cant language of the ribaldry in which he had been reared, forms an instructive commentary on the statements of these writers respecting what Fox describes as "being godly brought up." Perhaps it is due to his mother to believe that his father, under whose instruction he had so profited, had it in his power to be very provoking.

(for all at once it has come to be quite certain that the child *was* killed, and by Bonner too, and therefore he) "discharged him[8]." It is remarkable that on one point, Fox says absolutely nothing,—there is not a word of the prisoner's being asked to abjure, or recant, or submit, or amend his evil ways—no hint of his being offered, or signing, any bill (as Fox calls it), or of anything of the kind, so common on such occasions. I think, however, that every well-informed reader will suspect that so far as prudential reasons and "fear of the law" might weigh with a "bloody wolf," Bonner must have known that it would have been safer for him to whip two taylor prentices to death, and hide them in his coal-house, than to discharge one prisoner committed under the warrant of Sir John Mordant without a recanta-

[8] As it seems difficult to imagine that Fox could have received his account of this interview on any authority but that of John Fetty himself, it is worth while to subjoin the particulars, especially as it seems probable that there was no other authority (Fox certainly refers to none) for any one word of the story.

'At his first entering into the chamber, Fetty said, 'God be here, and 'peace.' 'God be here, and peace!' quoth Bonner, 'that is neither God 'speed, nor good morrow.' 'If ye kick against this peace,' said Fetty, 'then this is not the place that I seek for.'

"A chaplain of the bishop's standing by, turned the poor man about, 'and thinking to deface him said in mocking-wise, 'What have we here, 'a player?' Whilst this Fetty was standing in the bishop's chamber he 'espied hanging about the bishop's bed a great pair of black beads: 'whereupon he said, 'My lord, I think the hangman is not far off; for 'the halter' (pointing to the beads) 'is here already.' At which words 'the bishop was in a MARVELLOUS RAGE.

"Then, immediately after, he espied also standing in the said bishop's 'chamber in the window, a little crucifix (before which belike, Bonner 'used to kneel in the time of his hypocritical prayers). Then he asked 'the bishop what it was; and he answered that it was Christ. 'Was he 'handled so cruelly as he is here pictured?' quoth Fetty.

"'Yea, that he was,' said the bishop.

"'And even so cruelly will you handle such as come before you. For 'you are unto God's people, as Caiaphas was unto Christ.'

"The Bishop, being in a GREAT FURY, said, 'Thou art a vile heretic; 'and I will burn thee, or else I will spend all that I have, unto my gown.' ''Nay, my lord,' said Fetty, 'ye were better to give it a poor body, that 'he may pray for you?'

"But yet Bonner, bethinking himself of the danger that the child was 'in by *their* whipping, and what peril might ensue thereupon, thought 'better to discharge him; which thing was accomplished. Whereupon 'after this and such like talk, the bishop at last discharged him, willing 'him to go home, and carry his child with him," &c. Certainly if Bonner was a wild beast, Fetty was a Van Amburgh.

tion or submission, or some sort of voucher, to lay before the Council. But nothing, I repeat, is said about it.

Our business, however, is rather with the story of the unfortunate little creature, whom, for his impertinence, Fox has made a martyr. Within fourteen days after he had been taken home by his father the child is said to have died; and Fox most characteristically adds "Whether 'through this cruel scourging, or any other infirmity, *I* '*know not;* and therefore I refer the truth thereof unto 'the Lord who knoweth all secrets, and also to the discreet 'judgement of the wise reader;" discreet and wise historian —he gives no hint how he picked up the story, and does not venture to insinuate that the boy, or the father, or anybody else ever said that the Bishop even knew of the whipping. Such is the authority for Fuller's bold, brief, and, I suppose I may add, false statement.

But there is also the case of "Hugh Laverock a creeple, sixty-eight years old, whom he caused to be burned." It is really not worth while to waste time on such childish stuff. If Fuller had said that nobody, of any age, lame or not lame, ought to be burned for heresy, one would fully and heartily agree with him. The law by which it was done, was execrable, and should have been altered; but while the law existed, while the government enforced it, while public opinion and even the most violent partisans of the Reformation supported it, when, as far as I know, nobody had ever thought of saying a word against it—when things were in this state what was a judge to do? Half a century ago people in general, I believe, thought that a man who had committed forgery ought to be hanged; and, though our judges were not bloody wolves, it was a very rare thing for a convicted forger to escape the gallows. How the court and jury sworn would have stared if the counsel for the prisoner had admitted the fact without hesitation, declared that his client did it on principle, gloried in it, and would do it again as soon as he was discharged—for discharged he would of course be, seeing that he was sixty-eight years old, and could not walk without a crutch?

Such matter is not worth answering, but I must notice here again the language in which the statement is made. He describes the "lame old man of the Parish of Barking, painter," as one whom Bonner "*caused* to be burned." Of

course, if an author were writing history with any particular spite against the law of forgery and the late Serjeant Glynn, he might represent Dr. Dodd as a victim whom the bloody Recorder "*caused* to be hanged;" but surely nothing less than ignorance, or malice, or some particular notion of language, could lead any one to use such an expression, unless he meant to imply some particular causation. Now as to this poor man of Barking, very few particulars except his age and lameness are recorded by Fox; but yet it so happens that he does tell us that Hugh Laverock was charged with what was considered the grossest heresy[9]; and what is more to our purpose, we learn that one of the articles ministered to him and confessed by him, was this;—

"That thou, the said N., being convented before certain Judges or Commissioners for thy disorder herein, and being found obstinate, wilful, and heady, wast by their commandment sent to me and my prison, to be examined by me, and process to be made against thee for thy offence herein."

But let us for a while dismiss Fuller's wild beast, or forest of wild beasts, in order to introduce a very different character. When the reader of Fox has become sufficiently familiar with the "MARVELLOUS RAGE" and "GREAT FURY" that embellish so many of his descriptions of prelatical proceedings, to treat them as Mr. Burchell would have done[1],—

[9] "Amongst other things thou hast misliked and earnestly spoken 'against the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacrament of the Altar, and the 'Unity of the Church, railing and maligning the authority of the see of 'Rome and the faith observed in the same. . . . . Hast heretofore 'refused, and dost refuse at this present, to be reconciled again to the 'unity of the church. . . . . Hast affirmed expressly that the mass is 'idolatry and abomination," &c. *See Fox*, viii. 140, and compare vii. 715.

[1] In order even to know what this means, he must have read Fox a good deal, and not merely as I suspect some admirers of Fox do, but stopping now and then to think whether the facts which he states are really such (not merely in *degree*, but in *kind*) as to warrant the flourish with which he introduces them, or the comment which he appends to them. The RAGE and FURY of prelates and persecutors is of course a constant theme, and affords many ludicrous specimens of nonsense and falsehood; none perhaps more so than the following. If the reader turns to vol. v. p. 765, he will find that, at the "third Session against Bonner," after Cranmer had been addressing "the people," and telling them how Bonner went about to deceive them, and had appealed to the said people, to judge of the Denunciation against him, which he ordered

when he calmly inquires what these tales so full of rage and fury really mean, when they mean anything—he finds the bloody wolf transformed (I will not say into a spaniel, for that might imply fawning), but into something much more like a good-tempered mastiff, who might safely be played with, and who though he might be teazed into barking and growling, had no disposition to bite, and would not do it without orders. In plainer terms, setting aside *declamation*, and looking at the *details of facts* left by those who may be called, if people please, Bonner's victims, and their friends, we find, very consistently maintained, the character of a man, straightforward and hearty, familiar and humorous, sometimes rough, perhaps coarse, naturally hot-tempered, but obviously (by the testimony of his enemies) placable and easily entreated, capable of bearing most patiently much intemperate and insolent language, much reviling and low abuse directed against himself personally, against his order, and against those peculiar doctrines and practices of his church for maintaining which, he had himself suffered the loss of all things, and borne long imprisonment. At the same time not incapable of being provoked into saying harsh

to be read to them by Sir John Mason.—"This done, the Archbishop said again unto the audience, 'Lo! here you hear how the Bishop of London is called for no such matter as he would persuade you.' With this," continues the Martyrologist, "the bishop being in a RAGING HEAT, as one CLEAN VOID OF ALL HUMANITY, turned himself about unto the people [whom the Archbishop had made his judges] saying"——Now, what does the reader suppose he said? of course, such a torrent of oaths, and brutal blasphemies, as no scribe, though "clean void of all humanity," unless he were also in a "raging heat," could set down in writing. Not at all—nothing of the kind—the story of the mountain in labour is clean outdone, unless we can imagine a volcano and a dormouse. Fox's own words are literally what follow, "The bishop being in a raging heat, as 'one void of all humanity, turned himself about unto the people, saying, ''Well, now hear what the Bishop of London saith for his part.' But 'the commissioners, seeing his INORDINATE CONTUMACY, denied him to 'speak any more, saying that he used himself VERY DISOBEDIENTLY; 'with more like words of reproach." This is only given as one of many specimens continually recurring, and producing, often insensibly, by dropping on the minds of thoughtless readers, fixed and obstinate, though obscure and unfounded, ideas, that they have read dreadful things about shocking rage, and passion, and inordinate contumacy, and disobedience, and merited reproach, when in fact they have merely been duped by a tale "full of sound and fury"—not indeed "signifying nothing," but signifying something very different from what they have understood, or were meant to understand by it.

and passionate things, but much more frequently meaning nothing by the threatenings and slaughter which he breathed out, than to intimidate those on whose ignorance and simplicity argument seemed to be thrown away—in short, we can scarcely read with attention any one of the cases detailed by those who were no friends of Bonner, without seeing in him a judge who (even if we grant that he was dispensing bad laws badly) was obviously desirous to save the prisoner's life. The enemies of Bonner have very inconsiderately thrust forward, and perhaps even exaggerated, this part of his character, and represented him as a fawning, flattering, coaxing person,—as one only anxious to get submissions, abjurations and recantations which would rob the wild beast of his prey. That he did procure a considerable number of recantations, and reconciled a great many to the church of Rome, I have no doubt; some are incidently mentioned, and we may suspect that there were a great many more which are not recorded. Of course the Martyrologists are not to be blamed for this. Their business lay with those who did *not* recant. On several accounts we must not forget that a Book of Martyrs is a record of extreme cases. This is not the place to enter into details; but I do not hesitate to express my belief not only that Bonner procured the abjuration of a great number, but that this was one of the causes of that bitter hatred with which the puritans regarded him. It was not, as I have said, the duty of their historians to record such matters; nor could it be agreeable to the party to have them published either on the mountains of Gath, or on their own hill of Zion. But certainly while the public sufferings of their stedfast brethren formed in every point of view the best subject for invective, against the papists, for example to the protestants, and for political agitation of the people, there was, among the leaders, a great fear of the Bishop's powers of persuasion; or as Fox oddly calls them "the *subtle snares* of that *bloody wolf*."[2]

And while it may be proper to say that this phrase did not relate to traps set for fugitive heretics—for the person spoken of as "then in danger of the subtle snares of that bloody wolf Bonner," was already in captivity, and had

[2] Vol. viii. 414.

"been divers times before my lord in examination"—it is right to add that I do not recollect any instance in which Bonner was charged with any breach of faith, or promise, by prisoners whose lives he had saved by his old trade of persuading. I have found him reproaching some of them with broken promises; but on that point I do not recollect any retort. This however is rather anticipating; at least it will be more intelligible if we turn for a few moments from Bonner himself, to take a very slight and superficial look at his times; or rather at that particular period which preceded the time when he was called more particularly into public action and notice.

§ 2. SOME OCCURRENCES DURING THE FIRST YEAR AND A HALF OF QUEEN MARY'S REIGN.

It will enable us more clearly to understand some subsequent events to which our inquiry leads, if we first look at a brief list of some matters which occurred at the commencement of Queen Mary's reign. The reason for inserting some things of minor importance, while many of greater consequence are omitted, will be understood by all who consider that I am not professing to write a history, but merely to arrange in chronological order, those things to which our inquiry relates.

1553.

Thursday, July 6th.

On the death of her brother Queen Mary came to the throne.

Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's, had been "kept in prison a long time, and so remained when Queen Mary entered upon the government: upon which occasion he fell into the hands of the pope's butchers," &c.—*Strype, Cran.* I. 263.

Sunday, July 9th.

Were sworn unto Queen JANE, at Greenwich, "All the head officers, and the guard as Queen of England."—*Stry. Mem.* III. i. 4.

Ridley, Bishop of London, preached at Paul's Cross, "declaring there his mind to the people as touching the Lady Mary, and dissuaded them, alledging there the incommodities and inconveniences which might arise by receiving her to be their queen; prophesying, as it were, before that which after came to pass, that she would bring in foreign power to reign over them, besides the subverting of all christian religion then already established," &c.—*Fox*, vi. 389.

Thursday, August 3rd.

"Was the splendid day on which the Queen came riding to London, and so to the Tower."—*Stry. Mem.* III. i. 26.

Saturday, August 5th.

"Cam out of the Marsalsay, the old bysshop of London,' *Bonar*, and dyvers bysshops bryng hym home unto ys plasse at Powlles."—*Machyn*, p. 39[3].

Sunday, August 6th.

John Rogers, prebendary of St. Paul's, "made a godly and vehement sermon at Paul's Cross, confirming such true doctrine as he and others had there taught in King Edward's days, exhorting the people constantly to remain in the same, and to beware of all pestilent popery, idolatry and superstition."—*Fox*, vi. 592. *See Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog.* ii. 304.

Sunday, August 13th.

"Dyd pryche at Powlles Crosse doctur [Bourn] parson of hehnger [High Ongar] in Essex, the quen['s] chaplen and ther [was a] gret up-rore and showtyng at ys sermon, as yt [were] lyke madpepull, watt yonge pepell and woman [as] ever was hard, as herle-borle, and castyng up of capes; [if] my lord mer and my lord Cortenay ad not ben ther, ther had bene grett myscheyff done."—*Machyn*, p. 41. The preacher, who was also a canon of St. Paul's, was apparently in great danger; but rescued by *Rogers* (already mentioned) and *John Bradford* another of the canons, who pacified the tumultuous part of the assembly, and led Bourn between them to a place of safety.—*Fox*, vi. 391. *Stry. Mem.* III. i. 32.

Wednesday, August 16th.

"Was master *John Rogers* preacher commanded to keep himself prisoner in his own house at Pauls;"—*Fox*, vi. 393; and the same

[3] The work here quoted is "The Diary of Henry Machyn, citizen and merchant-taylor of London, from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563," recently published by the Camden Society. The public are much indebted to Mr. J. G. Nichols, for the ability and pains with which he has edited one of the most valuable records of the interesting period to which it relates; and which has been hitherto scarcely known except by the frequent references which showed how much Strype was indebted to it, while those who knew how ill-qualified he was to read, and to copy, MSS. felt that they could not place full reliance on his extracts. In this particular case, without meaning to take any liberty with his author, Strype has so altered the statement that readers (especially if they knew anything, and reflected at all) might well be puzzled and misled. Many a student, I dare say, has read the following passage with an uncomfortable consciousness that he could not name the captive prelates who were said to be set at liberty at this time. He has wondered what Strype could mean when he said (evidently following the words of Machyn), "Now came out of the Marshalsea, Bonner the old Bishop of London, being brought home unto his place at St. Paul's, and *together with him divers other bishops were set at liberty* from their confinements."—*Mem.* III. i. 27. The "dyvers bysshopes" it is obvious were not liberated captives, but brethren who went to the prison merely to bring out the bishop of London, and conduct him as a guard of honour and brotherly congratulation "unto ys plasse at Powlles."

day master *Bradford* was committed to the charge of the lieutenant of the Tower.—*Ibid.* 392. This was under the idea that the influence which they obviously possessed over the seditious part of the populace, indicated some connexion or sympathy.

Friday, August 18th.

A Royal proclamation was issued which prohibited preaching.—*Fox*, vi. 390. But he afterwards assigns it to the 21st of this month, p. 538, where he seems to be following Machyn, who says "The xxi day of August was a proclamasyon that no man shuld reson aganst her grases magesty and her conselle doyng the wych she wyll doe to the honor of God and ys moder," p. 42; but whether this was the same proclamation that is given at length by Fox I do not know.

Saturday, August 19th.

"A Letter was sent unto Sir *Henry Tirril*, *Anthony Brown*, and *Edmund Brown* Esquires, praying them to commit to ward all such as should contemn the Queen's order of religion or should keep themselves from church, there to remain until they be conformable, and to signify their names to the council."—*Fox*, vi. 538.

Tuesday, Aug. 22nd.

The council dispatched letters requiring the attendance of Bishops Coverdale and *Hooper*.—*Fox*, vi. 393.

Sunday, August 27th.

Cranmer was "cited to appear the week following before the Queen's Commissioners in the bishops Consistory within Pauls."—*Fox*, vi. 538.

Tuesday, August 29.

Bishop *Hooper* appeared before the Council.—*Fox*, vi. 393. *See Aug. 22nd.*

Friday, September 1.

Bishop *Hooper* was committed to the Fleet.—*Fox*, vi. 393. 647.

Monday, Sept. 4th.

The Council dispatched letters requiring the attendance of Bishop *Latimer*.—*Fox*, vi. 393.

Thursday, Sept. 7th.

Cranmer "set forth a letter which was also printed in purgation of himself." It is given at length in English by *Fox*, vi. 539; and in the original Latin by Burnet.

Wednesday, Sept. 13th.

Bishop *Latimer* appeared and was committed to the Tower.—*Fox*, vi. 393.

Thursday, Sept. 14th.

Cranmer was committed to the Tower.—*Fox*, vi. 394.

Saturday, Sept. 16.

There were "Letters sent to the Mayors of Dover and Rye, to suffer all french protestants to pass out of this realm, except such

whose names should be signified to them by the french ambassador."—*Fox*, vi. 394.

Sunday, Oct. 1st.

The Coronation. A pardon proclaimed to all but those in the Tower, and the Fleet, and 62 other persons.—*Fox, ibid.*

Sunday, Oct. 8.

Thomas Mountayn parson of St. Michaels in the Tower Royal "did minister all kynd of service" according to the order set forth by King Edward; "the whole parish being than gathered together," with "many other godly citizens." His own account of his proceedings may be read in *Strype, Mem.* III. i. 104. The circumstance is only mentioned here as one of those which illustrate the state of things at the period.

Sunday, Oct. 15th.

Lawrence Saunders preached at Alhallows Bread Street.—*See before*, p. 269, 271.

Monday, Oct. 16th.

The Convocation began; "in the which convocation master *Philpot* being present according to his room and degree, with a few others sustained the cause of the gospel manfully against the adversary part."—*Fox*, vii. 606.

Wednesday, Dec. 13th.

Is the date of the Queen's precept to the Bishop of London for dissolving the Convocation.—*Fox*, vi. 411.

Friday, Dec. 15th.

"There were two proclamations at London; the one for the repealing of certain Acts made by King Edward, and for the setting up of the Mass, for the 20th of December then next following: the other was that no man should interrupt any of those that would say Mass."—*Fox*, vi. 542.

1554.

Saturday, Jan. 13th.

"Dr. *Crome* for his preaching on Christmas Day without licence was committed to the Fleet."—*Fox*, vi. 413.

Friday, Jan. 26.

"Began wachyng at every gatt in arness, for tydyngs cam the sam tym to the quen and her consell, that ser Thomas Wyatt, ser George Harper, ser Hare Ysseley, master Cobham, and master Rudston, and master Knevetts, and dyvers odur gentyllmen and commons wher up, and tha say because the prynche of Spayne commyng in to have owre quen, for they kepe Rochaster castell and the bryge and odur plases."—*Machyn*, p. 52.

Saturday, Jan. 27.

Master *Rogers* committed to Newgate.—*Fox*, vi. 543.

Monday, Jan. 29.

Wyatt at Blackheath.—*Ibid.*

Thursday, Feb. 1.

Wyatt proclaimed a traitor at Chepe, and elsewhere. About three o'clock in the afternoon the queen rode from Westminster to Guildhall, made an oration to the Mayor and citizens; and then rode to the Three Cranes in the Vintry, where she took her barge for Westminster.—*Ibid.*

Wednesday, Feb. 7.

"In the forenoone, Wyatt with his army and ordnance were at Hyde Park Corner." In the evening he was sent to the Tower.—*Machyn*, p. 54. *See before*, p. 72.

Wednesday, Feb. 14.

"Letters were written to the Lord Rich, and to Sir John Wentworth to punish some in Colchester, Coxall [Coggeshall] and other places; who dissuaded people from frequenting such divine service, as was then appointed by law to be observed. Upon this, many were committed, and others put under recognizances to appear."—*Burnet*, Part III. B. v. p. 226.

Monday, Feb. 19.

This is the date of "The Declaration of the Bishop of London to be published to the Lay-people of his diocese concerning their reconciliation" which is given at length by *Fox*, vi. 708.

Friday, Feb. 23.

The date of Bonner's Monition to his clergy to note and report those who did not confess in Lent, and receive at Easter.—*Fox*, vi. 426.

Sunday, Feb. 25.

Sir *John Rogers* was committed to the Tower.—*Fox*, vi. 545.

Saturday, March 3.

The date of the Articles sent from the Queen to the Bishop of London, respecting heresies and crimes in his diocese, and other matters.—*Fox*, vi. 426.

Monday, March 5.

The Lord Mayor's prescript to the Aldermen concerning the same.—*Fox*, vi. 429.

This is also the date of a commission issued to six bishops (Winchester, Durham, London, St. Asaph, Chichester, and Llandaff,) to hear and consider the cases of Taylor bishop of Lincoln, *Hooper* bishop of Gloucester, and Harley, bishop of Hereford, reciting that in the preceding reign they had received their bishoprics "to hold during their good behaviors, with this express clause '*quamdiu se bene gesserint*,'" and stating that the Queen was minded to have their several cases dulie harde and considerid and there uppon such ordre taken with them as may stand with justice and the lawes.—*Rymer*, vol. xv.

Thursday, March 8.

According to Machyn, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer* came out of

the Tower, and so to Brentford, where Sir John Williams received them; and so to Oxford.—p. 57. Fox says that the letter for their delivery was sent to the Lieutenant of the Tower on the 10th, and that they were conveyed from the Tower to Windsor on the 10th of April, and thence to Oxford.—*Fox*, vi. 439. Burnet says the order was sent on the 8th.—Part III. book v. p. 226.

Friday, March 16.

Bishop *Ferrar*, and Bird bishop of Chester were deprived.—*Machyn*, 58.

Saturday, March 17.

Bishop *Hooper* was deprived.—*Ibid.*

Sunday, March 18.

The Lady Elizabeth committed to the Tower.—*Stry. Mem.* III. i. 150. *Fox*, vi. 548; viii. 608. *Machyn*, 58.

Sunday, March 25.

Easter Day. The Crucifix and Pix stolen at St. Pancras in Cheap.—*See before*, p. 187.

Monday, March 26.

"There was a letter directed to Sir Henry Doell, and one Foster, to attach the bodies of *Dr. Taylor*, parson of Hadley, and of Henry Askew, and to send them up to the Council."—*Fox*, vi. 439.

Sunday, April 8.

The Cat hanged in Cheap.—*See before*, p. 187.

Friday, April 13.

"A proclamasyon was made that what so mever he wher that cold bryng forth hym that dyd hang the Catt on the galaus, he shuld have xx marke for ys labur."—*Machyn*, p. 60.

Saturday, April 14.

The disputation at Oxford began.

Tuesday, April 24.

Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer condemned.—*Strype, Cran.* ii. 488.

Tuesday, May 8.

After the disputation at Oxford a report seems to have been raised that some of the preachers who were then imprisoned in London were to be sent to Cambridge, to hold a similar disputation there. At all events they put forth a "Declaration" under this date, to the effect that if any such thing should be proposed, they would not dispute otherwise than in writing, except before the Queen and her Council, or the Parliament Houses. It is given at length in *Fox*, vi. 550, and signed by;—

Bishop Ferrar,
Rowland Taylor,
John Philpot,
John Bradford,
John Hooper,
Edward Crome,
John Rogers,
Lawrence Saunders,
Edmund Lawrence,
I. P. and T. M.,
Miles Coverdale.

Friday, June 1st.

"An order was sent to the Bishop of London to send discreet and learned preachers into Essex, to reduce the people there."[4]—*Burnet*, Part III. book v. p. 227.

Wednesday, August 15th.

"Letters were writ to the justices of peace in Sussex, to punish those who railed at the mysteries of Christ's Religion."—*Burnet, ibid.* p. 228.

Sunday, August 19th.

"Letters of thanks are ordered to Tirrel, and others, for their care; ordering them to imprison all such as came not to divine service, and to keep them in prison till they had the comfort of their amendment."—*Ibid*[5].

Saturday, Sept. 8th.

About this time Bonner set out on his visitation.—*See before*, p. 38[6].—*Fox*, vi. 559.

Friday, Oct. 5.

On this day and a fortnight after, was the great stir about seditious books.—*See before*, p. 39.

Friday, Nov. 9.

"Master Barlow, late Bishop of Bath, and master *Cardmaker* were brought before the Council in the Star Chamber, where after communication they were commanded to the Fleet."—*Fox*, vi. 563.

Sunday, November 11th.

"The Third Parliament was summoned."—*Burnet*, Part II. Book ii. p. 270.

Saturday, Nov. 24.

Cardinal Pole arrived in London.—*Fox*, vi. 567.

Wednesday, 28th Nov.

The Cardinal made his Oration to the Parliament which supplicated absolution.—*Fox*, vi. 571.

---

[4] Burnet adds, "Bonner seemed to think of no way of reducing any but by severity and force; so that the Council found it necessary to put him in mind of his pastoral care." Bonner might, perhaps, have less turn for preaching, and less reliance on it, than his predecessor; and he might remember the time when the Protector Somerset and King Edward's Council had thought there was too much preaching in Essex, and had directed Bishop Ridley to take order for moderating it.—*See Strype, Mem.* vol. ii. P. i. p. 342.

[5] I give this as it stands in Burnet; but I do not feel sure that there is not some confusion with what has been given before, under the same day of the preceding year, in this volume.

[6] Where "the 23" ought to be "the 22nd," Strype having misunderstood Fox's words, "the day after St. Matthew's day, being the 22d of September," St. Matthew's day itself being the 21st.

Friday, 30th Nov.

The Parliament received absolution from the Cardinal.

Thursday, Dec. 6th.

"St. Nicholas's day, all the whole convocation, both bishops and others, were sent for to Lambeth to the Cardinal, who the same day forgave them all their perjurations, schisms, and heresies, and they all there kneeled down and received his absolution; and after an exhortation and gratulation for their conversion to the catholic church made by the cardinal, they departed."—*Fox*, vi..579.

1555.

Tuesday, Jan. 1.

Thomas Rose and a Congregation of thirty were taken in Bow Churchyard. For "there was a Congregation of godly men at London, in the very mouth of danger, who met together for religious worship all the Queen's reign, from the beginning to the very end of it. . . . . Upon any cases of difficulty or emergencies, this congregation *sent some of their members beyond sea, to some of the learned exiles there, for their resolution, counsel and advice; and so they returned again to the flock.* And some they had, whom they sent to the prisons, to visit, counsel, comfort, and relieve those that lay there for religion. . . . . Their meetings were at several places, as it was appointed by themselves; for they often changed their places for more privacy and security. Sometimes it was at Black Friars, at Sir Tho. Cardine's house, who was of the privy chamber to King Henry VIII. Again sometimes the meeting was somewhere about Aldgate; sometimes in a clothworkers loft, near the great conduit in Cheapside. Once or twice in a ship at Billingsgate, belonging to a good man of Lee in Essex. Other times at a Ship called Jesus Ship, lying between Ratcliff and Rotherhith; there twice or thrice, till it came to be known. Other times in a cooper's house in Pudden-lane. Sometimes in Thames street; *sometimes in Bow-church-yard;* and sometimes Islington, or in the fields thereabouts. These meetings were often in the night times. There would be in these assemblies forty, and sometimes an hundred, or more met together; and toward the latter end of the Queen the number increased, though the malice of their enemies decreased not. At these meetings they had collections for Christ's prisoners, and would gather sometimes ten pounds at a night meeting. But they could not be so private, but that now and then they were discovered and taken."—*Strype's Mem.* III. pt. ii. p. 147[7].

[7] It seems to be going so far back in history, that I must just remind the reader that it is not really farther than if we were now to speak of anything that happened about the time of the Battle of Navarino, if I say that this Thomas Rose is the person mentioned in "Fox's story of the Rood of Dover Court." (See p. 194 of this volume.) He had even before that time become a person of note, and John Bale (then a zealous papist) had been sent to preach against him. This affair of Dover Court seems to have brought him into more notice, and trouble; and he was

Wednesday, Jan. 16.

The Parliament was clean dissolved.

---

imprisoned in the Bishop of Lincoln's house in Holborn. In the first year of Cranmer's consecration, he was removed to Lambeth, and dealt with more courteously, and at length the Archbishop wrought his deliverance and set him at liberty. His zeal seems to have soon brought him into fresh difficulties. The Bishop of Norwich inhibited his preaching, and his adversaries so persecuted him that he was constrained to flee to London, and use the aid of the Lord Audley, the Lord Chancellor who removed the matter from them, and called it before him, set Rose free, and "did send him by a token to the Lord Cromwell, then Lord Privy Seal, for a licence from the King to preach." Cromwell not only got the licence for him, but made him his own chaplain. "In the mean time," says Fox, "such complaint was made to the Duke of Norfolk" that Rose preached what was contrary to the Six Articles (see before, p. 209), that he "being lieutenant commanded that whosoever could take the said Thomas Rose, should hang him on the next tree." However he got abroad, whence he afterwards returned, and obtained a benefice from King Edward. "But 'at the death of that vertuous and noble prince he was deprived of all, and 'so should have beene of his life, had not God appointed him friends who 'received him in London secretly, as their teacher in the congregation 'amongst whome for the poore prisoners at their assemblies x. li. a night 'oftentimes was gathered." [The comic edition has turned the ten pounds into forty-one persons or things, of what nature or kind is not apparent from the odd device adopted to express them, and reads "assemblies, *forty-one* [*] a night oftentimes *were* gathered." viii. 584. I mention this, because I was copying from that edition when I was puzzled by this unintelligible statement. And as my motive for using and referring to that edition is, that I suppose it to be much more accessible to my readers than any other, I should be sorry that after reading what I now copy from the edition of 1597, they should turn to their own books and think me inaccurate. Fox goes on to say,] "And thus he continued 'amongst them, with the Lady Vane almost a yeare in the raigne of 'Q. Mary. But although he oftentimes escaped secretly whilst he read 'to the godly in sundry places of London, yet at length through a Judas 'that betrayed them, he with xxxv. that were with him were taken in 'Bow Churchyard at a sheermans house on New yeres day at night being 'Tuesday."—*Fox*, Edit. 1597, p. 1889.

As however Thomas Rose was neither a martyr, nor meddled with by Bonner (though captured in his diocese), we have no business with his history, which is very curious and may be found in Fox as cited, or vol. viii. p. 581, ed. 8vo, and Strype's Cranmer, vol. i. p. 395, where the author has occasion to notice him as one of the persons whom the Primate recommended to Cecil for the Archbishopric of Armagh. But, as we have had so much on the subject, I may just mention that having been thus taken (evidently in the view of its being a *treasonable*, rather than an *heretical* meeting) he was brought *not* before the bishop of the diocese, *nor* before his own ordinary, but to the Lord Chancellor Gardiner, who "would not speak with him that night, but committed him to the Clink till Tuesday after." Fox then goes on to give as his *first* speech at his *first* examina-

Tuesday, Jan. 22.

"All the preachers that were in prison were called before the bishop of Winchester, Lord Chancellor, and *certain others*, at the bishop's house at St. Mary Overy's: from whence (after communication, being asked whether they would convert and enjoy the queen's pardon, or else stand to that they had taught; they all answering, that they would stand to that they had taught) they were committed to straiter prison than before they were, with charge that none should speak with them."—*Fox*, vi. 587.

Wednesday, Jan. 23.

"All the bishops with the rest of the Convocation-house were before the cardinal at Lambeth, where he willed them to repair every man where his cure and charge lay, exhorting them to entreat the people and their flock with all gentleness, and to endeavour themselves, to win the people rather by gentleness, than by extremity and rigour: and so let them depart."—*Fox*, vi. 587.

---

tion;—"'It maketh me to marvel, my lord,' quoth he, 'that I should be 'thus troubled for that which by the word of God hath been established, 'and by the laws of this realm allowed, and by your own writing so 'notably, in your book 'De vera Obedientia' confirmed;'" and in his reply to the interruption of the Chancellor, he so quoted the book that the indignant author replied, "Thou liest like a variet; there is no such thing 'in my book, but I shall handle thee and such as thou art well enough. 'I have long looked for thee, and at length have caught thee. I will 'know who be thy maintainers, or else I will make thee a foot longer." It does not appear that the threat was carried into execution. Thomas Rose was sent to the Tower and kept there nearly five months, during which time Gardiner came there twice and "had no great talk" with him, "but spake friendly." He is his own historian and does not tell us what they talked about, or whether he gave the Chancellor the information which he had threatened to extort by the rack. But the issue was, that about the end of May he was sent from the Tower to his own diocesan at Norwich, his escape seems to have been rather grossly connived at, he tarried beyond sea during the rest of Queen Mary's days; and was, when Fox wrote this history of him, "yet living, a preacher of the age of seventy-six years, of the town of Luton, and in the county of Bedford."

The reason for saying so much about Thomas Rose and the Congregation, may be found in the following extract from Fox, who is giving an account of this parliament:—"Also the doing of Master Rose, and the 'others that were with him, was communed of in this Parliament; and 'upon that occasion an act was made that certain evil prayers should be 'treason against the Queen's Highness. The prayers of these men were 'thus: God turn the heart of Queen Mary from idolatry: or else shorten 'her days;'" and he adds this note, "Hereof read the statute an. 1 & 2. reg. Phil. et Mar. cap. 9."—*Fox*, vi. 581. The reader who does not take that trouble will probably imagine that there was something rather more important in this matter, than a glance at Fox's account of it would suggest to a careless reader.

Friday, Jan. 25.

"The day of the conversion of St. Paul, there was a general and solemn procession through London, to give God thanks for their conversion to the catholic church: wherein (to set out their glorious pomp) there were fourscore and ten crosses, and one hundred and sixty priests and clerks, who had every one of them copes upon their backs singing very lustily. There followed also, for the better estimation of the sight, eight bishops; and, last of all, came Bonner, the bishop of London, carrying the popish pix under a canopy.

"Besides, there was also present the mayor, aldermen, and all the livery of every occupation. Moreover, the king also himself, and the cardinal, came to Paul's church the same day. From whence, after mass, they returned to Westminster again. As the king was entered the church at the steps going up to the choir, all the gentlemen that of late were set at liberty out of the Tower, kneeled before the king, and offered unto him themselves and their services."—*Fox*, vi. 588.

Monday, Jan. 28.

"The bishop of Winchester and the other bishops had commission from the cardinal to sit upon, and order, according to the laws, all such preachers and heretics (as they termed them) as were in prison; and according to this commission, the same day the bishop of Winchester and the other bishops, with certain of the council, sat in St. Mary Overy's church."—*Fox*, vi. 588.

§ 3. THE COMMISSION IN SOUTHWARK.

Thus we have cursorily run over the first year and a half of Queen Mary's reign, noticing very little beside what relates to those persons with whose history we are more particularly concerned. The reader will have observed several committals for political and religious offences; and the number might have been much increased but that the mention of them would only have served to divert or encumber us in our present inquiry. The truth seems to be, that by the latter part of the year 1554, the government had got a great many prisoners on its hands, and was anxious to dispose of them as soon as it well could; which was not until the Parliament had completed the business of the reconciliation of the country and the revision of the laws.

On Friday, Jan. 18th, therefore (only two days after the parliament had been "clean dissolved") the "Council went to the Tower, and discharged all or most part of the prisoners." (*Fox*, vi. 587.) We may do the same; for with those state prisoners we have little, if anything, to do.

It is more to our purpose to observe that the attention

of the Council was next turned to those who had been imprisoned on religious and ecclesiastical grounds.

I have already mentioned the Declaration which the imprisoned preachers put forth on the 8th of May. Whether there actually was a current report that they were to be sent to Cambridge, and this Declaration was really intended to meet it, or whether it was meant to remind those who seemed to have forgotten it, that they were in existence, I do not pretend to decide. That there is nothing either improbable, or uncharitable, in the latter supposition, is evident from the course which they after pursued. "They BOLDLY and BRAVELY," says Strype, "made a Declaration to the Queen and Parliament that sat this year;" and this "remarkable Declaration," as he justly calls it, he ascribes to the pen of John Bradford, and has "reposited in the Appendix" to his memorials of Cranmer[8]. In this Declaration the imprisoned preachers went to the point at once by beginning; "We poor prisoners for Christ's religion, require 'your Honours, in our dear Saviour Christ's name, earnestly 'now to REPENT, for that you have consented of late to the 'unplacing of so many godly lawes, set furth touching the 'true religion of Christ before, by two most noble Kings," &c. They vouch for it, "that there was not one Parish in 'al England, that ever desired again to have the Romish 'Superstitions and vaine service, which is now by the Popish, 'proud, covetous clergy placed again in contempt not only 'of God, al Heaven, and al the Holy Ghostes lessons in the 'blessed Bible: but also against the honors of the said two 'most noble Kings," &c. They declare that, "God's great plagues must needs follow," and desire the King, Queen, and Parliament in their assembly, "to seek some effectual REFORMATION for the aforewritten DEFORMATION in this Church of England." They request to be brought up before those authorities, and they add "if we be not able both to 'prove and approve by the catholic and canonical rules of 'Christ's true religion, the church Homilies and Service set 'furth in the most innocent K. Edward's days: and also to 'disallow and reprove by the same authorities the Service 'now set furth since his departing; then we offer our bodies 'to be immediately burned," &c.

[8] No. LXXXIV. p. 950, referring to p. 506.

As far as I am personally concerned, it would be uncandid not to state the doubt which I feel whether this document was actually presented to the Queen and Parliament in its present form. Strype however is the authority; and he gives it, without the least expression or appearance of doubt, from the Foxian MSS. and remarks upon it, "This now is the second time a PUBLIC CHALLENGE was made to justify King Edward's reformation," and he then proceeds to speak of a "third public challenge" made by these prisoners which, as it is given by Fox, he does not think it necessary to transcribe. I confess that I cannot help feeling some suspicion that this third challenge which Fox calls a "Supplication of the persecuted preachers to the King and Queen," is only a modification of the document already mentioned. It is enough, however, for our purpose that its principal object is the same; and the prayer of it is that the petitioners might be called before the King, Queen, and Parliament, to answer before them, or "indifferent arbiters" to be appointed by their Majesties, to such charges of heresy as had been brought against them.—*Fox*, vi. 589.

The exact date of these documents I do not find; but it is enough to know that they are said to have been delivered during this session of parliament which (as we have already seen) began in November, and was clean dissolved on the 16th of January. It has also been stated, that on Friday the 18th the Council went to the Tower to clear it. On the following Tuesday the 22nd of January they addressed themselves to the business of the "persecuted preachers," and a meeting at Gardiner's house, which has been already mentioned, took place.

In this month of January, a tribunal sat four times in Southwark, which in order to save trouble I follow many writers in calling a Commission[9]. The first session was on the 22nd of January, when "ALL the Preachers that were

[9] It is not worth while to discuss the question whether it was the Council meeting at the Lord Chancellor's house the first time, and a Commission afterwards; or whether it should uniformly be called by one of the names, or never by either. Its true nature and character will appear sufficiently from what follows; and that is all that is of real consequence. Writers have described it variously, but those only require contradiction who represent it as if Gardiner was sitting in his "ordinary jurisdiction," and carrying matters out of his own head and with his own hand, in his own house or Church in Southwark.

'in prison were called before the bishop of Winchester Lord 'Chancellor, and certain others, at the bishop's house at 'St. Mary Overy's."[1] Strype says that beside the Lord Chancellor, there were present the bishops of Durham, Ely, Worcester, Chichester, Carlisle, the Lord William Howard, Lord Paget, Sir Richard Southwell, Secretary Bourn[2].

While, according to Fox, the persons brought before this commission consisted of "all the preachers that were in prison," Strype mentions Bishop Hooper, Dr. Crome, Harold Tomson, Rogers, beside "divers others, to the number of eleven persons besides two more that were not then sent for," as being "arraigned" on that occasion[3].

The object in view does not appear to have been a scholastic disputation with these preachers, as with persons whose tenets were unknown or doubtful, but solemnly to inquire, and obtain a definite answer, whether they meant to maintain the opinions which they had professed, and to repudiate the reconciliation with the Church of Rome which the King, Queen, and Parliament had just made. Dr. Rowland Taylor, in the letter containing and reporting "The Talk had between him and the Lord Chancellor, and other Commissioners" on this occasion, says:—"First, my 'Lord Chancellor said, 'You among others are at this 'present time sent for, to enjoy the King's and Queen's 'Majestie's favour and mercy, if you will now rise again 'with us from the fall which we generally have received in 'this realm; from the which (God be praised!) we are now 'clearly delivered miraculously. If you will not rise with 'us now, and receive mercy now offered, you shall have 'judgment according to your demerit.' To this I answered 'that so to rise, should be the greatest fall that ever I 'could receive: for I should so fall from my dear Saviour 'Christ to Antichrist."[4]

Of course the men for the most part were well known and well tried. It was understood that their minds were made up. It was sinful and hateful to think of burning them, but it would have been absurd to propose disputing with them. They were, as they would have phrased it, "at a point;" and when the case stood as Taylor had pithily

[1] Fox, vi. 587.
[2] Mem. III. i. 330.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] Fox, vi. 685.

stated it, what room was there for argument? The time seemed to be come in which, according to the ideas of all parties concerned in the matter, either the preachers or the parliament must "repent"—in which the prisoners must be either acknowledged to be injured innocents, and dismissed in triumph; or condemned as heretics, and put to execution. Yet as far as I can see (except receiving the submission of two of the party whose names are not specified[5]) the Council did nothing but remand the prisoners until the following Monday.

January the 28th therefore the Commissioners sate again; not now however at the Bishop's Palace, but at the church of St. Saviour, or St. Mary Overy hard by[6]. Strype names as present the bishops of London, Worcester, Ely, Bath and Wells, Gloucester, Bristol, Durham, Carlisle, Lincoln, St. David's, Norwich, Coventry and Lichfield; and adds Anthony Hussey, Robert Johnson and William Say public notaries being appointed actuaries in this affair. "Besides 'there were present also the Duke of Norfolk, Anthony 'Lord Montague, Thomas Lord Wharton, Richard Southwel, 'Francis Englefield, Christopher [perhaps mistaken for 'Robert] Rochester, Thomas Wharton, John Hurleston, 'John Tregonwell, Philip Draycot, and John Germyngham,

[5] It seems probable that one of these was Harold Tomson abovementioned; as I see nothing more about him in the subsequent sessions. Besides, I do not find any account of him except this single notice in Strype, which is a mere copy from Machyn, who says, "The xxii day of 'Januarii was raynyd [arraigned] at my lord Chansseler plasse by-syd 'sant Mare Overes ser John Hoper latt bysshope of Glosetur, doctur 'C[rome], as the parsun of Wyttyngtun colege, harold Tomson, Rogars 'parsun or veker of sant Pulkers, and dyvers odur."—p. 80. Mr. Nichols refers to him in the Index as "Tomson, the herald," I dare say that is what is meant; though not finding any such herald mentioned in Noble, I applied to Sir Charles Young, Garter, who kindly informs me that he finds no trace of him at the College of Arms, but suggests the probability that he was not properly speaking a herald, but a herald-painter.

[6] Strype in one place tells us that "they sat in commission"—that is, under and by virtue of a Commission from Cardinal Pole dated that same 28th of January, and it is amusing to find him catching at this circumstance to expose the eagerness of the bloodthirsty persecutors—"the very same day (*such haste they made*) they sat in commission." Cran. ii. 495. In another place giving an account of the same Session he says "the bishop of Winton, by his ordinary authority, sat judicially in St. Mary Overie's church." The reader will see that it is as absurd to talk about hasty proceedings, as it is to represent the Bishop of Winchester as merely sitting in his official capacity of Ordinary in his diocese.

'Knights, William Coke, Thomas Martyn, Richard Dobbes, 'Knights, besides a very great multitude more present."[7]

There seems indeed to have been not only a great multitude present, but another much greater multitude who wished to be present, but could not get into the Church. Rogers, who drew up an account of his own examination there says that "the thousandth man came not in," and that when he and Hooper were remanded, they "had much to do to go in the streets."[8]

On this occasion the Commissioners "called before them 'these three, Master Hooper, Master Rogers, and Master 'Cardmaker, who were brought thither by the sheriffs; 'from whence after communication they were committed to 'prison till the next day, but Cardmaker this day submitted 'himself unto them."[9] Bishop Hooper and Rogers were remanded till the next day.

Tuesday, January 29, the Commissioners sate again at the same place. Measures seem to have been adopted for keeping out any such crowd as had been collected the day before, and Rogers says "they kept the doors shut, and would let none in but the bishops adherents and servants in a manner."[1] There must however have been a good many persons present if the assembly consisted (as Strype says it did) of "the bishops *above named*, together with George Bishop of Chichester," beside "those noblemen, 'and Knights and others *before mentioned*, and *these more-* 'over; Clement Higham, Richard Dobbes, Knight, Thomas 'Hungate Esq., John Seton, Thomas Watson, professors of 'Divinity, Nicholas Harpesfield, David Pole, Hugh Corens, 'doctors of the laws; Henry Jollif, Philip Morgan 'bachelors of divinity; Francis Allen, William Smyth, and 'John Vaughan Esqrs. and *many more*."[2] Fox tells us that on that occasion, "Hooper, Rogers, Dr. Taylor and 'Bradford were brought before them; where sentence of 'excommunication and judgment ecclesiastical was pro- 'nounced upon Master Hooper and Master Rogers, by the 'bishop of Winchester, who sat as judge in Caiaphas's seat; 'who drave them out of the church according to their law

[7] Mem. III. ii. 286.
[8] Fox, vi. 598. 599. 649.
[9] Fox, vi. 582.
[1] *Ibid.* 598.
[2] Mem. III. i. p. 288.

'and order. Dr. Taylor and Bradford were committed to 'prison till the next day."[3]

On Wednesday the 30th of January was the fourth session; at which, according to Strype, the bishops of Durham, Worcester, Ely, Lincoln, Bath and Wells, Norwich, Lichfield, and Carlisle were "co-assessors," and there were also present, "the Duke of Norfolk, the Lord Wharton; the Lord Lumley; Leonard Chamberlayn and Robert 'Drury, Knights; Thomas Hussey, John Vaughan, Thomas 'Martyn, Esqrs. R. [it may be Edward] Wotton, and John 'Warner, doctors in physic; Hugh Coren, David Poole, 'Nicholas Harpesfield, doctors of law; Thomas Watson, 'John Seton, doctors of divinity; Philip Morgan, John 'Boxal, Seth Holland, bachelors in divinity; Richard 'Chandler, archdeacon of Sarum and very many others."[4]

On this occasion, according to Fox, "Dr. Taylor, Dr. 'Crome, Master Bradford, Master Saunders, and Dr. Ferrar, 'some time bishop of St. David's, were before the said 'bishops; where three of them, that is to say Dr. Taylor, 'Master Saunders, and Master Bradford were likewise 'excommunicated, and sentence pronounced upon them; 'and so committed to the sheriffs. Dr. Crome desired two 'months respite, and it was granted him; and Master 'Ferrar was again committed to prison till another time."[5]

Whatever may have been the precise constitution or composition of this Tribunal, the names which I have copied show that it was not in the nature of a secret Inquisition. I do not see that it ever met afterwards at Southwark, or elsewhere in the same form. It seems as if it had been formed for some special purpose which it either accomplished, or abandoned; which of the two, it is not our present business to inquire.

§ 4. WHAT HAD BONNER TO DO WITH THE MARTYRS CONDEMNED BY THE COMMISSION.

(1.) JOHN ROGERS is one of those who have been already mentioned as being before the Commissioners. The first

[3] Fox vi. 588. Strype says of Taylor, "The Bishop assigned him to appear there again between three and four in the afternoon. What was done then appears not."—Mem. III. pt. i. p. 296.

[4] Mem. III. i. 290.

[5] Fox, vi. 588.

occasion in which I find Bonner charged as having anything to do with him is, that according to Fox, after his second trouble with the Council "he remained in his own house as 'prisoner a long time, till at length through the uncharit-'able procurement of Bonner bishop of London, who could 'not abide such honest neighbours to dwell by him, he was 'removed from his own house to the prison called New-'gate."[6]

It will be seen by referring to the list of events in the foregoing section, that Rogers was removed from his own house to Newgate on the 27th of January, 1554, the day after preparations began to be made in earnest for the reception of Wyatt and his rebels. It may have been a mistake, but certainly since the affair of Bourn's preaching at Paul's Cross on the 13th of August (to say nothing of anything previous) Rogers was considered, not simply as a believer in false doctrine, but as a demagogue, and seditious person. How much Bonner had to do with his being removed from his house to a place of greater security, I cannot tell; but I suppose the bishop is only brought in here by way of a gratuitous flourish. Certainly Rogers says, in his own account of his examinations[7], "I asked him" [*Gardiner* not *Bonner*] "Wherefore he put me in prison, He said, because I preached against the Queen;" and as far as I can see he throws the whole blame on the bishop of Winchester, and makes no complaint of the bishop of London.

After his sentence on the 29th of January, he made an application to the Chancellor in the court, for leave for his wife to visit him; which was refused (p. 602). I do not see that Bonner had anything to do with him until the morning of his execution, when "he was had down first to 'Bonner to be degraded. That done, he craved of Bonner 'but one petition. And Bonner asking what that should 'be; 'Nothing' said he 'but that I might talk a few words 'with my wife before my burning.' But that could not be 'obtained of him. 'Then' said he 'you declare your charity, 'what it is." (p. 609.) Whether Bonner had the power to grant such a request, even if it had not been previously made to, and refused by, the Lord Chancellor, I do not know.

---

[6] Vol. vi. 593.

[7] Fox, vi. 598.

(2.) LAURENCE SAUNDERS. The facts relating to the apprehension and commitment of this martyr have been so fully stated before (pp. 269, 273) that it is unnecessary here to repeat them. With regard to Bonner's share in those transactions, I have endeavoured to represent it fairly, and I do not see how any bishop of London could have done less than he did.

It has already appeared that Saunders was brought up before the Commissioners on January 30. It was I presume on that occasion[8] when Saunders was declaring that he had been brought up to disbelieve the supremacy of the Pope, the Chancellor asked him whether it was by "consent and authority" that he had received all his heresies respecting *the Sacrament of the altar*. He tried to evade the question by an irrelevant answer about the *papal supremacy*, including that species of personal reflection which Fox calls a "privy nip" to the Chancellor. On this Bonner (referring to the writing made before him some fifteen months before) said "and it like your lordship I have his hand against the blessed sacrament. How say you to that?" Saunders answered "What I have written, that I have written; and further I will not accuse myself."

I do not observe that Bonner had anything more to do with him, except what is thus briefly recorded by Fox; "The 4th day of February the bishop of London did come 'to the prison where he was to degrade him; which when 'he had done Laurence Saunders said to him, 'I thank God 'I am none of your church.'" (p. 627.) I do not find that the bishop made any reply.

(3.) BISHOP HOOPER, as has been stated, was "sent for by a pursuivant to be at London" for two causes; the first being the business of Dr. Heath, whom he had succeeded at Worcester; and "secondarily, to render an account to Dr. Bonner, Bishop of London, for that he in King Edward's time was one of his accusers[9]," &c. But Fox tells us that before he could come to the aforesaid Drs. Heath and

[8] If so, Fox calls it erroneously "The first Examination of Laurence Saunders," and represents him as being "convented before the Queen's most honourable Council, sundry bishops being present."—Vol. vi. p. 625.

[9] Vol. vi. p. 645. See Hooper's Denunciation of Bonner addressed to the King. *Fox*, vol. v. p. 747.

Bonner, "he was intercepted and commanded violently 'against his will to appear before the Queen and her 'Council to answer, to certain bonds and obligations, 'wherein they said he was bound unto her." This was on August 29, 1553, and on the 1st September a second time[1], and was committed to the Fleet.

On the 5th of March in the next year a Commission, as we have seen, issued; and on the 19th he was deprived. Bonner's name is among those of the Commissioners, but it does not appear that he took any part, or said a word, or had had any kind of intercourse with Hooper since his own deprivation about four years and a half before.

After several months more of imprisonment Hooper was, as we have already seen, brought before the Commissioners on the 22d, 28th, 29th of January, 1555; after which he "was delivered as close prisoner to the keeper of Newgate, where he remained six days."

"During this time, Bonner bishop of London, and others at his appointment, as Fecknam, Chedsey, and Harpsfield, etc. resorted divers times unto him to assay if by any means they could persuade him to relent, and become a member of their antichristian church. All the ways they could devise, they attempted: for, besides the disputations and allegations of testimonies of the Scriptures, and of ancient writers wrested to a wrong sense, according to their accustomed manner, they used also all outward gentleness and significations of friendship, with many great proffers and promises of worldly commodities; not omitting also most grievous threatenings, if with gentleness they could not prevail: but they found him always the same man, steadfast and immovable."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 650.

Fox cannot let this pass however without adding what is illnatured, and probably altogether untrue.

"When they perceived that they could by no means reclaim him to their purpose with such persuasions and offers as they used for his conversion, then went they about, by false rumours and reports of recantations (for it is well known, that they and their servants did spread it first abroad), to bring him and the doctrine of Christ which he professed, out of credit with the people. So the bruit being a little spread abroad, and believed of some of the weaker sort, by reason of the often resort of the bishop of London and others, it increased more, and at last came to master Hooper's ears: wherewith he was not a little grieved, that the people should give so light credit unto false rumours, having so simple a ground; as it may appear by a letter which he wrote upon that occasion, the copy whereof followeth."—*Ibid.*

[1] Fox, vi. 393. He makes it the first appearance, p. 645.

What motive could Bonner and his chaplains have for spreading such a report? Fortunately, Fox has also given Hooper's own account of the matter, and it is not only written in a tone which shows that he took their proceedings civilly, but that he expected his popish adversaries to make a candid report of himself.

"Such is the report abroad (as I am credibly informed,) that I, John Hooper, a condemned man for the cause of Christ, should now, after sentence of death (being in Newgate prisoner, and looking daily for execution) recant and abjure that which heretofore I have preached. And this talk ariseth of this, that the bishop of London and his chaplains resort unto me. Doubtless, if our brethren were as godly as I could wish them, they would think, that in case I did refuse to talk with them, they might have just occasion to say that I were unlearned, and durst not speak with learned men; or else proud, and disdained to speak with them. Therefore, to avoid just suspicion of both, I have and do daily speak with them when they come; not doubting but that they report that I am neither proud nor unlearned."—*Ibid.* p. 651.

On Monday[2] the Bishop came to Newgate to degrade him and Rogers. Fox gives a particular account of the form, and the persons present, but does not intimate that there was anything done, or a word spoken, except the ceremonial proceeding. Some pages afterwards, in a rhetorical "Comparison between Hooper and Polycarp," he mentions as a point of difference that Hooper was not only martyred but "degraded by Bonner with such contumelies and reproaches, as I think in Polycarp's time was not used to any," p. 661. This, however, I presume, only refers to the common order of the ceremonial; for if Bonner had done any thing personally uncivil or extra-official we should have been pretty sure to hear of it. Burnet begins a paragraph by saying, "It was resolved to begin with Hooper; 'against whom both Gardiner and Bonner had so peculiar 'an ill-will, that he was singled out of all the bishops to be 'the first sacrifice[3].'" This, however, like a good deal more which such writers have said respecting Gardiner and Bonner, is, I apprehend, nothing but ornamental suggestion, unsupported, if not clearly contradicted by facts.[4]

[2] So Fox, vi. 651. But on the next page he says on the 4th of February, which was a Tuesday. Yet he says "Monday" was the 4th of February.

[3] Vol. iii. p. 240.

[4] I have really looked in vain for actions which might seem to indicate vindictive feeling in Bonner towards any of those to whom he might be

(4.) ROWLAND TAYLOR.—I do not find that Bonner had anything to do with him until he had been condemned by the Council. Then the Bishop went to the Compter to degrade him. The scene is thus described by Fox;—

"Being come, he called for the said Dr. Taylor to be brought unto him; the bishop being then in the chamber where the keeper of the Compter and his wife lay. So Dr. Taylor was brought down from the chamber above that, to the said Bonner. And at his coming, the bishop said, 'Master doctor, I would you would remember

---

supposed to feel a grudge. I know the language of party declamation; but when one examines the facts it shows its true nature, and recoils on the writers. Who, for instance, can read, without feelings more unpleasant than those of mere pity, the following Heads of Chapters, as they stand in the Table of Contents prefixed to Strype's life of Sir Thomas Smith?

"CHAP. V.

"Sir Thomas Smith in Commission. Words between Bishop Bonner and him. His fidelity to the Duke of Somerset . p. 37

"Smith in a Commission against the anabaptists. One of the visitors of Cambridge. In Commission upon Bishop Bonner who would have declined him. Smith deals roundly with him. His words to Bonner's servants. Bonner enters a recusation against Smith. Who charges him with disobedience. Smith in trouble with the Protector. Deposed against Bishop Gardiner. Makes a purchase. Goes in embassy to France."

"CHAP. VI.

"The condition of Sir Thomas Smith under Queen Mary. His wise advertisements . . . . . p. 46

"He loses all his places. He hath an indulgence from the Pope. Bishop Gardiner his friend. Gains Gardiner's favour upon his first address to him from Cambridge. Ascham favoured by Gardiner. Even Bishop Bonner pretends to be Smith's friend."

I suppose that if Mr. Strype had been asked what he meant by "pretends," he would have been as much puzzled as Goldsmith was when asked the meaning of "slow" in the first line of his Traveller. How, or what, did Bonner "pretend"? Strype's own account of the matter in the place referred to by that very table of contents is simply "Nay, bloody Bonner who had a personal pique against him since the last reign, as was shown before, *let him alone*, though he were in his diocese, *admiring the man*, and dissembling his anger."—p. 50. But poor Mr. Strype cannot make this admission without the marginal caution "Bonner *pretends* to be Smith's friend."

If Bonner really did let Smith alone, I see nothing of *pretence* in it; and as to his admiring him, I think nobody but Strype would have suggested anything so very simple. If, however, I were writing to eulogize Bonner, in the servile spirit of hero-worship which sometimes renders Strype so absurd, I should claim high credit for the restored Bishop's acknowledged forbearance towards a man who had treated him with most

yourself, and turn to your mother, holy church; so may you do well enough, and I will sue for your pardon.' Whereunto master Taylor answered, 'I would you and your fellows would turn to Christ. As for me, I will not turn to Antichrist.'

"'Well,' quoth the bishop, 'I am come to degrade you: wherefore put on these vestures.' 'No,' quoth Dr. Taylor, 'I will not.' 'Wilt thou not?' said the bishop. 'I shall make thee ere I go.' Quoth Dr. Taylor, 'You shall not, by the grace of God.' Then he charged him upon his obedience to do it: but he would not do it for him; so he willed another to put them upon his back. And when he was

offensive insolence; and I should rather ascribe Smith's safety to the generosity of his enemies, than represent it as "owing to that *deference* that that stern and cruel Bishop Gardiner had to his exemplary virtue and learning: he was struck with a kind of admiration of the man *pretending* a great love to him;" though, of course, I should be glad to represent two such bloody wolves as guarding a forward and sturdy reformer through times of trouble, out of mere deference to virtue, and admiration of the man. And, perhaps I should ask, "What did Smith do to repay his deep obligation to the deprived and imprisoned Bonner, when he had himself become a great man at the Court of Elizabeth? Did the spared and screened protestant shew himself grateful for the forbearance which had connived at his bold, uncompromising, zeal, and stood between him and the stake during all the bloody reign of bloody Mary? or did he let his admiring benefactor live and die in a gaol?'

I might, I say, if I wrote as the eulogist of Gardiner and Bonner very plausibly claim for them credit to which I really believe they are in no wise entitled. I do not imagine that Smith had much to thank them for. I suppose that no reflecting reader of Strype can doubt that Secretary Smith, like his equally religious, and protestant, colleague, Secretary Cecil, turned papist on the accession of Mary. He was not indeed (any more than Cecil) continued as Secretary; but "he fell easy," says Mr. Strype, "for his life was saved, though he were a Protestant, and had 100*l.* per annum allowed him for his subsistence, but was charged not to depart out of the realm." Very droll it is to find this good historian, who has talked of Smith's being a "constant embracer of the reformed religion," and of his having "had a great hand in the reformation of the Church of England, in which he so steadfastly persevered," admitting that from the circumstances of the time this sturdy protestant "could hardly keep himself always upon his legs" (though that, I presume, must mean his official, rather than his religious legs), and afterwards telling us with a confiding simplicity, what really surprised himself,—"But that which is strange, he acted his part so dexterously in these difficult times, that even his enemy the Pope sheltered him under his bull for many transgressions of his own laws."—p. 47. When such an example had been set them, can we honestly make much of Gardiner's courtesy, and Bonner's connivance? Surely they could afford to be civil if the Pope was. I do not believe they were possessed by a spirit of retaliation and revenge; but, if they were, it must have been sufficiently gratified by seeing the late insolent Jack-in-office, sunk into "a silent stander-by" with his 100*l.* per annum, the Pope's indulgence, and their patronage.

thoroughly furnished therewith, he set his hands to his side, walking up and down, and said, 'How say you, my lord? am not I a goodly fool? How say you my masters? If I were in Cheap, should I not have boys enough to laugh at these apish toys, and toying trumpery?' So the bishop scraped his fingers, thumbs, and the crown of his head, and did the rest of such like devilish observances.

"At the last, when he should have given Dr. Taylor a stroke on the breast with his crosier-staff, the bishop's chaplain said: 'My lord! strike him not, for he will sure strike again.' 'Yea, by St. Peter will I,' quoth Dr. Taylor. 'The cause is Christ's, and I were no good Christian, if I would not fight in my Master's quarrel.' So the bishop laid his curse upon him, but struck him not. Then Dr. Taylor said, 'Though you do curse me, yet God doth bless me. I have the witness of my conscience, that ye have done me wrong and violence; and yet I pray God, if it be his will, to forgive you. But from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us!' And in going up to his chamber, he still said, 'God deliver me from you! God deliver me from you!' And when he came up, he told master Bradford (for they both lay in one chamber), that he had made the bishop of London afraid: 'for,' saith he laughingly, 'his chaplain gave him counsel not to strike me with his crosier-staff, for that I would strike again; and, by my troth,' said he, rubbing his hands, 'I made him believe I would do so indeed.'"—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 691.

The only other mention that I find of Bonner's name in connexion with Taylor's, is that Fox says that when the martyr arrived at the place where he was to suffer, he "with both his hands rent his hood from his head, and so 'it appeared that his head was notted[5] evil favouredly, and 'clipped much like as a man would clip a fool's head; which 'cost the good bishop Bonner had bestowed upon him when 'he degraded him." I do not see that Bonner had anything else to do with him.

JOHN BRADFORD[6], as we have seen had been imprisoned from August 16, 1553, till he was brought before the Council of the 22nd January, 1555, and I do not find

[5] "NOTT, for notted, shorn, cut close, or smooth; from to *nott*, to 'shear or poll; . . . . 'he caused his own head tc bee polled, and from 'thenceforth, his beard to be *notted* and no more shaven.'—*Stowe's* '*Annals*. . . . . NOTT-PATED or NOTT-HEADED, *a.* from the above. 'Having the hair close cut."—*See Nares's Glossary.* The comic edition reads "knotted." What could the editor suppose it to mean? It is hardly necessary to say that the allusion is to that cutting of the priest's hair which constituted a part of the ceremonial of degradation.

[6] I place him here because he was one of those condemned by the Commissioners; but without a number, because, owing to the delay in his execution, his name will occur again hereafter.

that Bonner had anything to do with him during that interval.

At his coming before the Council on the 22nd January[7], he began his address to it by stating that in the matter of Bourn at Paul's Cross, for which he had been imprisoned, he had done nothing seditiously, but had acted as a faithful and obedient subject. The Chancellor interrupted him by saying "There was a loud lie; for, quoth he, the fact was seditious, as you my Lord of London can bear witness." Bonner, thus appealed to, replied, "You say true my 'Lord, I saw him with mine own eyes, when he took upon 'him to rule and lead the people malapertly; thereby de-'claring that he was the author of the sedition." Bradford protested that, "notwithstanding my lord bishop's saying and seeing," he had told the truth; and after a few intermediate words between him and the Lord Chancellor, he repeated this assertion; adding, "Yea, my lord, I dare say 'that my lord of Bath, master Bourn will witness with me 'that I sought his safety with the peril of mine own life; I 'thank God therefore." If Bishop Bourn made any reply it is not reported; but Bishop Bonner is stated to have said "That is not true; for I myself did see thee take upon thee too much." To this Bradford returned a contradiction; until the Chancellor proposed that they should "leave this matter" (which, though Bradford had thought fit to introduce it, really was not the matter in hand) and asked him point blank, "How sayest thou now? Wilt thou return again," &c.

Bradford was again before the Council at the sitting of the 29th of January, and the only way in which Bonner's presence is noticed is this—that Gardiner said in reply to some observations of Bradford, that he had himself "been 'challenged for being too gentle oftentimes. Which thing 'the bishop of London confirmed and so did almost all 'the audience, that he had been even too mild and gentle."[8]

He was again before the Council on the next day; but I do not see that Bonner took any part in the proceedings, nor do I find that he had anything more to do with Bradford except at an accidental interview which is thus described by Fox:—

[7] Fox, vol. vii. 150.

[8] Fox, vol. vi. 757.

"Upon the 4th of February, that is the same day master Rogers was burned, Bonner bishop of London came to the Compter in the Poultry, to degrade Dr. Taylor, about one of the clock at afternoon. But before he spake to master Taylor, he called for John Bradford which was prisoner there, whom when he saw, he put off his cap, and gave him his hand, saying:

"*Bonner.* 'Because I perceive that ye are desirous to confer with some learned men, therefore I have brought master archdeacon Harpsfield to you. And I tell you, you do like a wise man. But I pray you go roundly to work, for the time is but short.'

"*Brad.* 'My lord, as roundly as I can I will go to work with you: I never desired to confer with any man, nor yet do. Howbeit if ye will have one to talk with me, I am ready.'

"*Bonner.* 'What,' quoth the bishop in a fume to the keeper, 'did you not tell me that this man desired conference?'

"*Keeper.* 'No, my lord, I told you that he would not refuse to confer with any; but I did not say that it is his desire.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, master Bradford, you are well beloved, I pray you consider yourself, and refuse not charity when it is offered.'

"*Brad.* 'Indeed, my lord, this is small charity, to condemn a man as you have condemned me, which never brake your laws. In Turkey a man may have charity; but in England I could not yet find it. I was condemned for my faith, so soon as I uttered it at your requests, before I had committed any thing against the laws. And as for conference, I am not afraid to talk with whom ye will. But to say that I desire to confer, that do I not.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, well.' And so he called for master Taylor, and Bradford went his way."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 165.

I believe that I have fairly stated all the concern which Bonner had with Rogers, Saunders, Hooper, Taylor, and Bradford; who seem to have been the only persons actually condemned by the Council at the sittings of January 1555. Two others (Ferrar and Cardmaker) did aftewards suffer martyrdom, and will be mentioned hereafter. Two, Crome and Tomson, seem to have recanted. This however makes only nine out of the eleven who are said to have been brought up, and who probably were far from being all the persons examined. Who the others were I know not. But whether there were more or fewer prisoners before these Commissioners is of little consequence in our inquiry; for, if more who afterwards suffered as martyrs, were examined on these occasions, they will come before our notice again in the history of their sufferings; and if they escaped, we have no business with them.

The point for us to observe is, that after these four sittings of the Council, there seem not to have been any similar proceedings. The view of the matter given by Fox,

and followed I believe by most writers, may be seen by the following extract.

"After that Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had got the laws and the secular arm on his side, as ye have heard, with full power and authority to reign and rule as he listed, and had brought these godly bishops and reverend preachers aforesaid under foot, namely, the archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Ridley bishop of London, master Latimer, master Hooper bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, master Rogers, master Saunders, Dr. Taylor, and master Bradford, all which he had now presently condemned, and some also burned, he supposed now all had been cock-sure, and that Christ had been conquered for ever, so that the people, being terrified with example of these great learned men condemned, never would nor durst once rout against their violent religion."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 703.

Then, after a good deal intended to shew that the Commissioners were not only as bad as the Turks but particularly and specifically like them, Fox proceeds:—

"And thus condemned they these godly learned preachers and bishops aforesaid, supposing, as I said, that all the rest would soon be quailed by their example. But they were deceived; for within eight or nine days after that Stephen Gardiner had given sentence against master Hooper, master Rogers, master Saunders, Dr. Taylor, and master Bradford, being the eighth of February, six other good men were brought likewise before the bishops for the same cause of religion, to be examined, whose names were William Pygot, butcher; Stephen Knight, barber; Thomas Tomkins, weaver; Thomas Hawkes, gentleman; John Laurence, priest; William Hunter, apprentice.

"Stephen Gardiner, seeing thus his device disappointed, and that cruelty in this case would not serve to his expectation, gave over the matter as utterly discouraged, and from that day meddled no more in such kind of condemnations, but referred the whole doing thereof to Bonner bishop of London; who supplied that part right doubtily, as in the further process of this history hereafter evidently and too much may appear. Thus bishop Bonner taking the matter in hand, called before him in his consistory at St. Paul's (the lord mayor, and certain aldermen sitting with him,) the six persons aforenamed, upon the 8th of February in the year aforesaid, and on the next day, being the 9th of February, read the sentence of condemnation upon them, as appeareth in Bonner's own registers: such quick speed these men could make in despatching their business at once."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 704.

A reader would naturally suppose that within eight or nine days after sentencing the five martyrs of whom we have spoken, Bishop Gardiner and everybody else was taken by surprise, and startled, by the apparition of six fresh men who had suddenly sprung forward to take the places of their

fallen comrades. Burnet would confirm his notion by telling him in plain terms "soon *after the condemnation* of these men, six others were *apprehended* on the account of heresy."[9] Wily Winchester one would suppose was not prepared for anything of the sort, and finding that the five martyrs had revived in six fresh ones, "as if in death were propagation too," he turned them over to Bonner, who was always ready for any cruelty, and called them before him the very day that they came into his hands, scarcely asked what they were charged with, sentenced them the next day, and killed them out of hand without grace or mercy—"such *quick speed* these men could make in despatching their business at once" such care they took to "SPARE NONE." Strype, who generally lays hold on Fox's skirts, and follows him blindfold through all sorts of places, even where one might think that he must have known the way better, says that Gardiner "left the rest of this bloody work 'to Bishop Bonner; and those six before mentioned *he 'began with;* who having been convented before him *but 'the day before,* were condemned *this very next day.*"[1] Savage work certainly; but what can one expect from bloody wolves, and forests of wild beasts?

But what if it should turn out that these six new martyrs whom Bonner "began with" were persons whom he had known a long time, and with whom he was particularly well acquainted? and what if the "quick speed" should prove to be mere habitual misrepresentation, not meaning to tell an elaborate and well considered untruth about these particular facts, but naturally as it were, from long practice, colouring with different colours, and commenting with fulsome flattery or childish malice on the acts of different parties, and thus, in the most unprovoked and reckless manner casting abroad the firebrands of personal calumny and historical falsehood? Facts and dates which Fox himself supplies, afford sufficient information; and show that Bonner did not first become acquainted with these persons on the 8th of February, 1555. *Thomas Hawkes* had certainly got the character of a heretic, and committed his alleged heresy, in Essex, and been sent up with a letter under charge of a special messenger to his ordinary Bonner from the Earl of Oxford, and was in actual

[9] Hist. of Ref. vol. ii. p. 282. [1] Mem. III. i. 332.

custody in the bishop's house, before Midsummer 1554. *Thomas Tomkins* the weaver was also a prisoner there; if indeed one should so characterize a man making hay at Fulham, with the bishop sitting by chatting with him. When he went there I know not, but certainly in or before July, 1554. As to *William Hunter*, he had been formally denounced as a heretic nearly a year before, and had fled from London on that account. I do not find precisely on what day he came into Bonner's hands, but he had "continued in prison three quarters of a year," when he was brought before Bonner on the 8th of February, 1555. Of the other three, *Pygot*, *Knight*, and *Laurence*, I do not find the exact time when they came into Bonner's custody: but as Bonner in the first conversation that he had with Hawkes, at Midsummer 1554, asked him if he knew Knight and Pygot, it is plain that he must by that time have known something of them himself[2]. I find also certain "Articles and Interrogatories objected by the Bishop of London" to these three jointly, in which the seventh is as follows:—

"7. Whether is it true, that you being suspected, or infamed to be culpable and faulty in speaking against the sacrament of the altar, and against the very true presence of Christ's natural body, and the substance thereof in the said sacrament; and thereupon called before me upon complaint made to me against you; have not been *a good space in my house*, having freely meat and drink, and also divers times instructed and informed, as well by one being our ordinary, as also by my chaplains and divers other learned men, some whereof were bishops, some deans, and some archdeacons, and every one of them learned in divinity, and minding well unto you, and desiring the safeguard of your soul, and that you should follow and believe the doctrine of the catholic church, as afore, concerning the said sacrament of the altar; and whether you did not at all times since your said coming to me, utterly refuse to follow and believe the said doctrine concerning the said sacrament?"—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 738.

It would seem as if the same articles had been objected to the other three, but really Fox's way of writing is such that it is difficult to get at the bottom of any story. After giving these articles, he says, "*Their* answers to these articles were not much discrepant from Tomkins, and other like martyrs above mentioned, as here followeth to be seen;"[3] and then he gives, "The Answers of *Pygot* and *Knight* to the afore-

[2] Fox, vii. 99.

[3] Fox, vol. vi. 738.

said Articles," omitting *Laurence*. It is likely that the latter made a separate confession[4].

This is, I think, enough to shew how very unfair and untrue it is to represent the condemnation of these six men as having been carried with careless and merciless dispatch. Bad as it was to burn them, there is no pretence for saying that it was done in a hurry. Even after Bonner had passed sentence on them, and they had been delivered to the secular power, it can hardly be said that "quickspeed" was used in carrying that sentence into execution. The earliest sufferer of the six was allowed an interval of five weeks for reflection, and the others were burned on the 26th, 28th, and 29th of March and the 10th of June.

I say thus much here respecting these six prisoners, partly to refute on the spot the idle calumny with which their history is introduced; and partly because they are said to have been (though I know not when or where) before "the bishops," by which I suppose we are to understand the Commission. They were however, as may be seen, in a peculiar manner Bonner's prisoners (those "he began with"), and their cases will come more properly before us in the history of his dealings with those heretics who were proceeded against in his court.

§ 5. BONNER'S DEALINGS WITH HIS OWN PRISONERS.

Having seen how much Bonner had to do with the martyrs examined by the Commission in Southwark, let us briefly inquire what he did afterwards. Let us allow the King, Queen, and Council, the Commissioners, and the Chancellor, to follow their own pleasure unnoticed, while we attend on the proceedings of Bonner. Let us suppose that (as some writers represent it) the whole business of the persecution was turned over to him, and cursorily look at his course,

[4] Pygot (as has been already stated) was a butcher, and Knight a barber; and they seem as if they had received their opinions from Dr. Taylor of Hadley. Laurence was a priest, and I do not find any account of the reason, or the time, of his coming into trouble; unless he was the same person as "Master Laurence of Barnhall," who is mentioned as "the first" in a list of the "Principal Teachers of Heretical Doctrine in London by Stephen Morris's Confession" (Fox. viii. 384);—but who Stephen Morris was, or when he made his confession, I do not know, nor have I found anything more about him in Fox.

imagining, as far as we can, that he was acting purely according to his own will, and upon his own responsibility.

I cannot, however, help suspecting that, by this time, some readers who have been used to think of Bonner as a sort of ecclesiastical Autocrat, have begun to doubt whether in point of power, influence, and position in the state, he was quite as great a person as they have supposed —whether he actually had, or desired to have, the unlimited powers of destruction ascribed to him, or even an intense and insatiable desire to use to the uttermost those powers with which he was invested by his office. I should be sorry, however, for the reader, at this early stage of the business, to think that I am fighting with shadows. I am not so fond as to expostulate with the poet who tells us, as a general fact, that when a martyr suffered,

> —— "Bonner, blithe as shepherd at a wake,
> Enjoyed the shew, and danced about the stake."[5]

But I think it may be well to refresh the reader's memory and feelings by a curious extract from one of our regular historians of the Reformation, who writes as if he had actually been at Bonner's elbow, and heard his soliloquy, on receiving his appointment as deputy-executioner from the Lord Chancellor.

"Well then, said Bonner to himself, I see the honour of this work is reserved for me, who neither fear the Emperor's frowns, nor the people's curses. Which having said (as if he had been pumping for a Resolution) he took his times so to make it known unto the other two, that he perceived they were as willing as himself to have the Catholick Religion entertained in all parts of the Kingdom, though neither of them seemed desirous to Act any thing in it, or take the envy on himself; that he was well enough pleased with that reservedness, hoping they did not mean it for a precedent unto him or others, who had a mind to shew their zeal and forwardness in the Catholick cause. Have I not seen (saith he) that the Hereticks themselves have broke the Ice, in putting one of their own number (I think they called him by name of Servetus) to a cruel death? Could it be thought no crime in them, to take that more severe course against one of their Brethren, for holding any contrary Doctrine from that which they had publickly agreed amongst them? And can they be so silly, or so partial rather, as to reckon it for a Crime in us, if we proceed against them with the like severity, and punish them by the most extream rigour of their own example? I plainly see, that neither you my Lord Cardinal, nor you my Lord

[5] Cowper, Expostulation, i. 96.

Chancellor, have any Answer to return to my present Argument, which is sufficient to encourage me to proceed upon it. I cannot Act Canonically against any of them, but such as live within the compass of my Jurisdiction, in which I shall desire no help nor countenance from either of you. But as for such as live in the Diocese of Canterbury, or that of Winchester, or otherwise not within my reach in what place soever, let them be sent for up by order from the Lords of the Council, committed to the Tower, the Fleet, or any other Prison within my Diocese; and when I have them in my Clutches, let God do so, and more to Bonner, if they scape his Fingers."—*Heylin, Hist. Ref.* p. 218.

I have already said that I believe the whole number of Marian martyrs amounted to 277; and that those with whom Bonner was in any way concerned, were 120. We have seen what he had to do with the five who were before the Council; and I suppose that, with their cases, I may dismiss that of Archbishop Cranmer, of which also I have already spoken. Let us look, then, at those who may be more properly called Bonner's prisoners[6].

(5.) THOMAS TOMKINS has been already mentioned, but as there was a peculiarity in his case which has led to his being brought forward as an instance of Bonner's cruel disposition, it is necessary to say something more about him. That he was an honest, simple, and godly man, who never performed any act even of his business as a weaver without prayer, and who showed his kindness to his friends by the freedom with which he lent his money without interest, was the testimony of his neighbours to Fox, who says,

"Of whom more than half a dozen at once came to me discreet and substantial men reporting the same to me, recording moreover what followeth. That Dr. Bonner bishop of London kept the said Tomkins with him in prison half a year; during which time the said bishop was so rigorous unto him that he beat him bitterly about the face, whereby his face was swelled. Whereupon the bishop caused his beard to be shaven, and gave the barber twelvepence."—*Fox*, vi. 718.

---

[6] I take them in the order in which they stand in the Martyrology, numbering them for the convenience of using a list which I annex; referring likewise to the volume and page of the octavo edition; which, as I have already said, I quote because I believe it to be the most accessible to my readers; and, moreover, notwithstanding its manifold and ludicrous blunders, it serves as a sort of reference to all the old editions, and contains many things which are in none of them except the first. It is curious that, though in very different senses, it may be truly said that there are two *original* editions of Fox.

I am afraid that more than half a dozen of Fox's friends contributed stories to his martyrology, which it is not easy to understand without some explanation. How much is afforded by the paragraph which immediately follows what I have just quoted, I do not take upon me to decide. But here it is;—

"Touching which shaving of Thomas Tomkin's beard, this is more to be added: Bishop Bonner, having Tomkins with him prisoner at Fulham, in the month of July, did set him with his other workfolks to make hay; and seeing him to labour so well, the bishop, setting him down, said, 'Well, I like thee well; for thou labourest well: I trust thou wilt be a good catholic.' 'My lord,' said he, 'St. Paul saith, He that doth not labour is not worthy to eat.' Bonner said, 'Ah! St. Paul is a great man with thee.' And so, after such other talk, the bishop inferring moreover, wished his beard off, saying, that so he would look like a catholic. 'My lord,' said Tomkins, 'before my beard grew I was, I trust, a good Christian, and so I trust to be, my beard being on.' But Bonner, in fine, sent for the barber, and caused his beard to be shaven off. The very cause was, for that Bonner had plucked off a piece of his beard before."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 718.

But a more serious charge of cruelty has been brought against the bishop for burning the hand of Thomas Tomkins; a feat thought worthy of a large wood cut in the old editions, which has been copied in the new one.

Whether it was wisely done, people may dispute; but that it was kindly meant no person of common sense can doubt. Fox himself acknowledges that Tomkins's hand was burned with the taper "to try his constancy."[7] For what other purpose could it be done, but to try whether a poor, simple, man who was tenacious of opinions which seemed immoveable by reasoning and argument, and would infallibly cost him his life, might be saved by rousing his fears, and giving him a severe foretaste of the suffering to which he was exposing himself? Fox's account is,—

"Bonner the bishop, being greatly vexed against the poor man, when he saw that by no persuasions he could prevail with him, devised another practice not so strange as cruel, further to try his constancy; to the intent, that seeing he could not otherwise convince him by doctrine of Scriptures, yet he might overthrow him by some forefeeling and terror of death. So, having with him master Harpsfield, master Pembleton, Dr. Chedsey, master Willerton, and others standing by, he called for Thomas Tomkins, who, coming before the bishop, and standing as he was wont in defence of his

[7] Vol. vi. 718.

faith, the bishop fell from beating to burning: who, having there a taper or wax candle of three or four wicks standing upon the table, thought there to represent unto us as it were, the old image of king Porsenna. For as he burned the hand of Scævola, so this catholic bishop took Tomkins by the fingers, and held his hand directly over the flame, supposing that by the smart and pain of the fire being terrified, he would leave off the defence of his doctrine which he had received."

Yet such is the force of nature (for habit really is second nature) that Fox cannot drop the story without adding (on the very same page on which he acknowledges that "the bishop thought by that means to drive him from his opinions") that "Bonner hitherto not contented with the 'burning of his hand, rested not until he had consumed his 'whole body into ashes at London in Smithfield[8]."

But I must call the reader's attention to one fact which will often recur, and which is very important to notice. Fox admits that this attempt to "overthrow" Tomkins was not made until the bishop "saw that *by no persuasions* he could prevail with him;" and he further states, that when the prisoner was brought up on the 8th of February, "the 'bishop went about to *persuade* him (with words rather 'than with reason) to relinquish his opinions, and to return

[8] The story is very absurdly and instructively introduced by Strype. After giving an account of Bonner's death in the reign of Elizabeth, he says of him;—"This man was *commonly reported* to be an atheist, and 'to have said *secretly*, that there was no such place of torment as hell; 'that he denied God, the scriptures, and any life after this; and that he 'used conjuring and witchcraft. This was upbraided to him in a letter 'by *one unknown*, upon his condemnation of Mr. Philpot. But what-'soever credit is to be given to all that, this that follows is MATTER OF 'FACT; which I transcribe out of an ancient paper among other AUTHENTIC 'MSS. in my custody: viz.

"Boner burnt Thomas Tomkins's hand with a candle in a most horrible 'manner, as is evidently known. Which Tomkins, before his apprehend-'ing, dwelt in Shoreditch."—*Ann.* Vol. I. pt. ii. p. 298.

It is worth while to add, that this "ancient paper" gives the history of John Fetty, jun., and his whipping, without so much as suggesting that Bonner ever knew of his existence.—*Ibid.* p. 299.

One thing I believe to be true; and, if it is, it deserves the attention of the reader; namely, that in the stories of Bonner's burning the hand of one or two of his prisoners, and in those of his scourging others, it is not pretended that he ever did, or availed himself of, either of these things, or any things of the kind, as modes of torture, or to induce the confession of guilt or accomplices, or any confession or consequence *except* such as would have tended to save the prisoner from more severe punishment, which it was not in his discretion to remit.

'again to the unity of the catholic church, promising if he 'would do so to remit all that was past. But he constantly 'denied so to do. When the bishop *saw he could not con-* 'vince him," he brought forward interrogatories for him to answer the next day, and "in the meantime he should deliberate with himself what to do." The next morning at 8 o'clock, Tomkins went and gave in his answers to the articles; and then Bonner drew forth a Confession, which he had signed as long before as the 26th of September, and caused it to be openly read; and then again he "*willed him* 'to revoke and deny his said opinions, the which he utterly 'refused to do; and therefore was commanded to appear 'before the bishop again in the same place at two o'clock in 'the afternoon." When he came up at two o'clock "before the bishops of London, Bath, and St. David's with others" . . . . "he was earnestly exhorted by the said bishop of Bath, *to revoke and leave off his opinions;*" but he professed his resolution to continue in them. "Then Bonner caused all his articles and confession to be again openly read, and so in his *accustomed* manner, *persuaded with him* to recant." His answer showed that it was useless; and "the Bishop *seeing he would not recant*, did proceed in his law, and gave sentence of condemnation upon him." What else could the Bishop do? what else could have been done by any judge who did *not* thirst for blood, in such circumstances?

(6.) WILLIAM HUNTER.—"The notable history of William 'Hunter apprentice of nineteen years pursued to death by 'Justice Brown, for the Gospel's sake; worthy of all young 'men and parents to be read," is not less worthy the notice of those who desire to understand the history of the times, and especially the history of Bonner and his proceedings. It is of that class which is for our purpose peculiarly valuable. I mean those accounts which were written either by the martyrs themselves, or by their relations or friends. It is unnecessary to explain why such documents, though perhaps partial, ignorant, and even intentionally false, are of inestimable value, as the flint, or the steel, or perhaps only the tinder, which properly brought together help to give real and true light to history.—This is the testimony of Robert Hunter, the martyr's brother; no friend,—but, strange to say, apparently no enemy,—to Bonner.

William Hunter seems to have been born in Essex, of

parents who held the reformed doctrine, and who apprenticed their son to Thomas Taylor, a silk-weaver in London. At the first Easter after the accession of Queen Mary, he refused to receive the communion at his parish church; and the priest threatened to bring him before the Bishop of London. His master, who is said to have apprehended danger from keeping him, sent him, either through fear or kindness, to his friends in Essex.

After he had been with his father at Brentwood five or six weeks, he went one day into the chapel and began reading aloud. "One father Atwell a sumner" coming in, they got into a dispute; in which the Sumner (according to Robert Hunter's account) not being able to answer the apprentice, left the chapel "in a GREAT FURY" and fetched Thomas Wood, the vicar of South Weald, who then took up the dispute. They got upon the topic of the real presence, at that time the most dangerous, and after threats and high words they parted; Hunter to save himself by flight, and Wood to denounce him to Justice Brown[9].

The Justice sent for Hunter's father, and the constable; and when the fugitive, after some days, learned that his father was likely to be troubled on his account, he surrendered himself. When he was brought up, the Justice caused a bible to be fetched, and disputed until he was "in 'SUCH A FURY with William, and SO RAGED, that William could 'not speak a word but he crossed him and scoffed at every 'word. Wherefore William, seeing him in SUCH A FURY, 'desired that he would either hear him quietly, and suffer 'him to answer for himself, or else send him away. To the 'which Master Brown answered, 'Indeed I will send thee 'to-morrow to my Lord of London, and he shall have thee 'under examination;' and thus left off the talk, and made 'a letter immediately, and sent William Hunter with the 'constable to Bonner, Bishop of London, who received William[1]."

I must remind the reader, and beg him to keep in mind, that the account of this young man's reception by the Bishop, which we are about to look at, comes to us from himself, through the medium of his brother. It is not likely that,

[9] See before, p. 333, under Aug. 19th.
[1] Fox, vi. 725.

writing "in SUCH A FURY," Justice Brown framed a very ingratiating letter of introduction for the prentice to deliver to the bishop; but,

"After that he had read the letter, and the constable returned home again, the bishop caused William to be brought into a chamber, where he began to reason with him in this manner: 'I understand, William Hunter,' quoth he, 'by master Brown's letter, how that you have had certain communication with the vicar of the Wield, about the blessed sacrament of the altar; and how that ye could not agree: whereupon master Brown sent for thee, to bring thee to the catholic faith, from the which, he saith that thou art gone. Howbeit if thou wilt be ruled by me, thou shalt have no harm for anything that thou hast said or done in this matter.' William answered, saying, 'I am not fallen from the catholic faith of Christ, I am sure; but do believe it, and confess it with all my heart.'

"'Why,' quoth the bishop, 'how sayest thou to the blessed sacrament of the altar? Wilt thou not recant thy saying, which thou confessedst before master Brown, how that Christ's body is not in the sacrament of the altar, the same that was born of the Virgin Mary?' To the which William answered, saying, 'My lord, I understand that master Brown hath certified you of the talk which he and I had together, and thereby ye know what I said to him; the which I will not recant, by God's help.'

"Then said the bishop, 'I think thou art ashamed to bear a faggot, and recant openly; but, if thou wilt recant thy sayings, I will promise thee that thou shalt not be put to open shame: but speak the word here now between me and thee, and I will promise thee it shall go no further, and thou shalt go home again without any hurt.' William answered and said, 'My lord, if you will let me alone, and leave me to my conscience, I will go to my father and dwell with him, or else with my master again; and so, if nobody will disquiet or trouble my conscience, I will keep my conscience to myself.'

"Then said the bishop, 'I am content, so that thou wilt go to the church, and receive, and be shriven; and so continue a good catholic Christian.' 'No,' quoth William, 'I will not do so, for all the good in the world.' 'Then,' quoth the bishop, 'If you will not do so, I will make you sure enough, I warrant you.' 'Well,' quoth William, 'you can do no more than God will permit you.' 'Well,' quoth the bishop, 'wilt thou not recant indeed by no means?' 'No,' quoth William, 'never while I live, God willing.'"—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 726.

How are we to account for Hunter's meeting with such a reception, except by believing, what seems obvious enough, and is not contradicted, but strongly confirmed, by the sequel, that, far from thirsting for his blood, and springing on his prey like a "bloody wolf," the bishop pitied a hopeful, but, as he thought, mistaken and headstrong youth,

who had run himself into such danger, and wished to save his life?

By this conversation, however, the bishop seems to have discovered in some degree, though not entirely, and perhaps not very accurately, what sort of person he had to deal with. He dropped the persuasive, and assumed the severe. "The 'bishop (this talk ended) commanded his men to put 'William in the stocks in his gatehouse, where he sat two 'days and nights, only with a crust of brown bread and a 'cup of water." But here again Bonner was mistaken, and his severity seemed to promise as little as his persuasion. At the two days end, when he went to see his prisoner, he found the bread and water untouched; and it appeared as if the captive meant to starve himself to death. The bishop ordered his men to set him free, and let him breakfast with them. It is probable that though William Hunter had not used his mouth for eating, he had not kept it shut during his confinement; for his brother tells us (of course, on his authority) that the bishop's men so far obeyed their master that "they let him forth of the stocks, but would not suffer him to eat with them, but called him heretic." He was not at a loss for an answer, but told them "he was as loth to be in their company as they were to be in his."

However, he had a breakfast; and afterwards the bishop sent for him and demanded whether he would recant? and finding him stedfast (he would have said obstinate) he appears to have thought that his severity had failed, only because he had not been severe enough; and that by something more terrific the youth might be intimidated into submission. Accordingly, "the bishop sent him to 'the convict prison, and commanded the keeper *to lay* '*irons upon him as many as he could bear* . . . . and then 'he parted, and the bishop allowing him a halfpenny a 'day in meat or drink."

That the order to the gaoler was given in the young man's presence, or made known to him, either by the bishop or the gaoler, is obvious; and it seems probable that, so far as it was executed, it was a part of a system of rigour that was tried during the early part of his imprisonment. There is sufficient reason for believing that he was not loaded with irons, or harshly treated, during the greater part of his long captivity; for his brother

tells us that, after it was ended, and when the martyr had been returned into Essex for execution, both his parents expressed their joy that he had been kept stedfast in the faith, and assured him that they had prayed for it, and never doubted about it. "William's father 'said, 'I was afraid of nothing but that my son should 'have been killed in the prison by hunger and cold; the 'bishop was so hard to him.' But William confessed, 'after a month, that his father was charged with his 'board, that he lacked nothing; but had meat and clothing 'enough, yea even out of the court, both money, meat, 'clothes, wood and coals, and all things necessary."

To go back, however, to the period of his commitment—his brother says;—

"Thus he continued in prison three quarters of a year. In the which time he had been before the bishop *five times*, besides the time when he was condemned in the consistory in Paul's, the 9th day of February: at the which time I his brother Robert Hunter was present, when and where I heard the bishop condemn him, and five others."

On that occasion Bonner again inquired if he would recant, and read his examination and confession. He then entered into an argument with him on the eucharist; but, after a while, seeing he made no impression, "he said, 'I have 'always found thee at this point, and I see no hope in 'thee to reclaim thee unto the catholic faith, but thou wilt 'continue a corrupt member:' and then pronounced sen-'tence upon him how that he should go from that place 'to Newgate for a time, and so from thence to Brentwood, ''Where,' said he, 'thou shalt be burned.' Then the 'bishop called for another," &c.

Surely it will not be said that this was a hasty sentence, or one pronounced while there was hope of its being averted by the prisoner's submission. Was Bonner's conduct throughout the affair that of a man who thirsted for the blood of a victim? Could he have done more? At all events could he do more when the terrible sentence had been pronounced? Yes, even then he did not give the matter up. He resolved to make one further effort. The historian, the affectionate, but honest, brother of the martyr (whose narrative, by the way, never betrays the least symptom of animosity against Bonner, while he is

severe enough on Justice Brown by whom his brother was "pursued to death") tells us, that when the bishop, having gone through the cases of the five other prisoners, had condemned them all, and thereby, we may add, had given the apprentice time to realize and consider the punishment to which he was sentenced, while it was thus repeatedly awarded to the others,

"He called for William Hunter, and *persuaded with him;* saying, 'If thou wilt yet recant, I will make thee a freeman in the city, and give thee forty pound in good money to set up thine occupation withal: or I will make thee steward of my house, and set thee in office; for I like thee well. Thou hast wit enough, and I will prefer thee if thou recant.' But William answered, 'I thank you for your great offers: notwithstanding, my lord,' said he, 'if you cannot persuade my conscience with Scriptures, I cannot find in my heart to turn from God for the love of the world; for I count all things worldly, but loss and dung, in respect of the love of Christ.'

"Then said the bishop, 'If thou diest in this mind, thou art condemned for ever.' William answered, 'God judgeth righteously, and justifieth them whom man condemneth unjustly.' Thus William and the bishop departed."—*Fox*, vol. vi. p. 727.

I have given this story the more fully, because it forms a part of the popular history of England. I am afraid that, as it stands here, it will meet the eye of very few in comparison with the tens of thousands who have read it as it is more briefly, but I think not more correctly, related in the pages of Hume.

"One Hunter, a young man of nineteen, an apprentice, having been *seduced by a priest into a dispute*, had *unwarily* denied the real presence. Sensible of his danger, he immediately absconded; but *Bonner*, laying hold of his father, threatened him with the greatest severities, if he did not produce the young man to stand his trial. Hunter, hearing of the vexations to which his father was exposed voluntarily surrendered himself to Bonner, and was condemned to the flames by that barbarous prelate."—*Hist. of Eng.*, vol. iv. p. 415.[2]

[2] Hume was probably indebted for a good deal of this to Burnet, who tells the story in a very characteristic manner. "The next that suffered, 'was one William Hunter of Brentwood, an apprentice of nineteen years 'old, who had been drawn on in discourse by a priest, till he brought him 'to deny the presence in the sacrament, and then was accused by him. 'His own father was made to search for him, to bring him to justice; but 'he, to save his father from trouble, rendered himself. Bonner offered 'him forty pounds if he would change, so mercenary a thing did he think 'conscience to be: but he answered, if they would let him alone, he 'would keep his conscience to himself, but he would not change; so he

(7.) THOMAS CAUSTON. (8.) THOMAS HIGBED, are here brought in by Fox, before the three which remain of those who were condemned with William Hunter, and I follow his order. He says that they were "two worshipful gentlemen in the county of Essex," the one of Horndon on the Hill, the other of the parish of Thundersley, and therefore clearly in Bonner's diocese. How soon they were questioned I do not find; but Fox says that they were zealous "and could not long lie hid and obscure;" and, in fact, they were committed to Colchester Castle. In that place Bonner (I suppose on his visitation) accompanied by "Master Fecknam and others," visited them, "thinking to reclaim 'them to his faction and fashion; so that great labour and 'diligence was taken therein, as well by terrors and threat-'enings, as by large promises, and flattering, and all fair 'means to reduce them again to the unity (as they termed 'it) of the mother church. *In fine* when nothing could 'prevail to make them assent to their doings, at length they 'came to *this point*"—the reader of course expects that Fox is going on to tell how the fire was instantly lighted, and the prisoners put into it;—but instead of that, "they" [that is the said prisoners] "came to *this* point, that they 'required certain respite to consult with themselves what 'was best to do. Which time of deliberation [what it was 'he does not say] being expired, and they remaining still 'constant and unmoveable in their professed doctrine, and 'setting out also their confession in writing, the bishop 'seeing no good to be done in tarrying any longer there, 'departed thence and [left them for execution? Not at all] 'carried them both with him to London."

When they got to London they were "committed to 'strait prison, and there attempted sundry ways by the 'bishop and his chaplains to revoke their opinions: at 'length, *when no persuasions would serve*, they were brought 'to open examination at the Consistory in Paul's, the 27th 'day of February, 1555[3]," where they were asked by the

'was condemned, and sent to be burnt near his father's house, where he 'suffered on the 20th of March."—*Hist. Ref.* Part II. B. ii. p. 286. Good reader, would you rather be known among your friends as the man who proffered the forty pounds, or the man who thus records it?

[3] It seems as if the 17 and 18, which stand in some editions, should be 27 and 28 for two reasons—one that Fox says (p. 731, bottom), "the

bishop of London, the bishop of Bath and others, whether they would recant, and on their refusal they were remanded till the next day.

February 28. They appeared accordingly and "among many other things there said and passed," Articles were ministered to them, which they were required to answer the next day. There is no need to notice any but the first, and that only because so much has been said of Bonner's going out of his bounds. It was, I presume, to be found in the articles of every prisoner brought into that court, "First, 'that thou Thomas Causton (or Thomas Higbed) hast been 'and art of the diocese of London, and also of the jurisdic-'tion now of me, Edmund, bishop of London."

March 1. They were brought up and exhibited their answers; after which the bishop said to them, "Because 'ye shall not be suddenly trapped, and that men shall not 'say that I go about to seek snares to put you away, I have 'hitherto respited you, that you should weigh and consider 'with yourself your state and condition, and that you 'should while ye have time and space, acknowledge the 'truth, and return to the unity of the catholic church." After further examination, they were ordered to appear on the next Wednesday; but it seems that they did not in fact appear again for a week; but were next brought up

Friday, March 8. The Bishop, Fecknam, and Dr. Stempe, appear to have reasoned with Causton, and notwithstanding his refusal to make any recantation, "the bishop still *persuaded* with him to recant." But in vain. Then, "the bishop leaving master Causton calleth for master Higbed, using with him the like *persuasions* that he did with the other." But equally in vain, and both were again remanded till the next day.

Saturday the 9th of March, they were brought up, the bishop caused Causton's articles to be read openly and then "*persuaded* with him to recant and abjure his heretical opinions and to come home now, at the last, to their mother the catholic church, and save himself." Causton answered

---

next day was assigned them," &c., and then goes on (over leaf) "Upon *that day*, being the *first day of March*," &c.—The other reason is, that the 17th, said to be the day of their first appearance, was a Sunday.

the bishop, that he came there with no such purpose; and producing a long confession of faith in the name of himself and Higbed, "required leave to read the same; which, after great suit, was obtained. And so he read it openly in the hearing of the people." Fox gives it with a title which states, that it was "delivered to the Bishop of London, before the Mayor and Sheriffs, and in the presence of all the people there assembled." How far the proceeding was quite regular, I do not know; but I suppose it was a matter of indulgence, as it is said to have been granted only after "great suit." And we may very well believe that the suit was granted on the Confession being previously looked at, and found to be (for such it really was) temperate, and free from those personal insults to the bishop, and those attacks on his faith, which he considered blasphemies, but in which too many of his prisoners were apt to indulge "in the presence of all the people." At the same time it cannot be denied, that the bishop might be influenced by the consideration, that it was so bold, plain, and uncompromising, that it would clear him, and show "the people" that unless he should set aside all law there was but one course which he could pursue.

When the confession had been read, "the bishop, *still* '*persisting sometimes in fair promises, sometimes threatening* '*to pronounce judgment*, asked them whether they would 'stand to this their confession and other answers?" To which Causton replied, that they would; "after which answer the bishop began to pronounce sentence against him."

But the prisoner interrupted him; and insisted on his right to have the confession which had been read, answered "by the truth of God's word;" and said that as he could "not have justice" (so he called a public disputation on these points of faith, in the Consistory Court, at this stage of its proceedings) he would appeal to Cardinal Pole. On this Dr. Smith offered to answer their confession; but "the bishop (not suffering him to speak) willed Harpsfield to say his mind, for the stay of the people;" and he, according to Fox's account, "taking their confession in his hand, neither touched nor answered one sentence thereof." After this the bishop pronounced sentence on Causton; and then he proceeded to the articles and answers of Higbed. It is

needless to repeat the conversation which ended by the bishop's again asking him "whether he would turn from his 'error, and come to the unity of their church? To whom 'he said, 'No; I would ye should recant: for I am in the 'truth, and you in error.' 'Well,' quoth the bishop, 'if 'ye will return, I will gladly receive you.' 'No,' said 'Higbed, 'I will not return as you will have me, to believe 'in the sacrament of the altar, your God.' Whereupon the 'bishop proceeded, and gave judgment upon him."

They were then delivered to the sheriffs of London by whom they were kept in Newgate a fortnight; after which (on the 23rd of March) they were delivered to the sheriff of Essex, and they were burned on the 26th of the same month.

(9.) WILLIAM PYGOT. (10.) STEPHEN KNIGHT. (11.) JOHN LAURENCE. After what has been just said (p. 359) of these three martyrs, it may be sufficient to add, that as it appeared that no quick dispatch had been made in bringing them to trial, so also, no indecent haste was made in executing the sentence pronounced against them. On the 9th of February Pygot and Knight were brought before the bishop "into his great chamber in his palace, where *he persuaded with them* to recant, and deny their former profession."—"The Bishop also used certain talk unto John Laurence only"—that is, I presume, he conversed with the priest apart from the butcher and the barber—after which they joined the other prisoners, Tomkins and Hunter, in the Consistory whence after talk and "other *fair words and threatenings*," they were remanded until the afternoon. "At that hour they came thither again, and there, *after the accustomed manner*, were exhorted to recant and revoke their doctrine, and receive the faith." But, "when the bishop saw that neither his *fair flatterings*, nor yet his *cruel threatenings*, would prevail, he gave them severally their judgments."

They were immediately delivered to the Sheriffs of London, and Pygot and Knight were burned on the 28th, and Laurence on the 29th of March.

(15.) WILLIAM FLOWER, *alias* BRANCH. Of this "rash indiscreet man[4]," who rushed on the officiating priest at St.

[4] Burnet, Hist. of Reform. ii. 290.

Margaret's, Westminster, and shed his blood upon the consecrated hosts, I have had occasion to speak already (p. 192). Immediately on the commission of his offence, which was on Easter Sunday, the 14th of April, 1555, he was committed to the Gatehouse at Westminster. On the following Friday he was as Fox states, "convented before Bonner *his Ordinary;*" and "the bishop, after he had sworn him upon a book (according to his ordinary manner) ministered Articles and interrogatories to him." The Articles and the answers having been given, Fox proceeds;—"After this examina-'tion done, the bishop began *after the best sort of his fine* '*divinity to instruct him, and exhort him* to return again to 'the unity of his mother the catholic church, with *such* '*reasons as he is commonly wont to use to others, promising* '*many fair things* if he would so do, besides the remitting 'of what was past." Flower thanked him, but told him that though he might kill his body he had no power over his soul, and that he would never go from what he had spoken concerning the sacrament whatever might be done to him. The bishop remanded him till the afternoon, willing him "in the meantime, to advise himself of his former answers, whether he would stand to the same his opinions or no:" and when in the afternoon he was again brought up, "the bishop sitting in his Consistory, spake these words: 'Branch, ye were this forenoon here before me, and made 'answer to certain articles; and thereupon I respited you 'till now, to the intent you should consider and weigh with 'yourself your state; and to remember while you have 'time, both your abominable act, and also that evil opinion 'which ye have conceived, touching the verity of Christ's 'true natural body in the sacrament of the altar:' to whom 'the said Branch answered again, and said as followeth: '''That which I have said, I will stand to; and therefore I 'require that the law may proceed against me.'" The notary having thereupon again read over the articles, and he having asked, and obtained, leave to make one or two alterations in his answers, not affecting the principal questions, "the bishop turning again to his old manner of 'exhorting, went about with words (and words only) to 'persuade him to submit himself to the catholic church, 'and to the faith therof;" and remanded him till the next day.

Then, as Fox proceeds to state, he "was brought by his 'keeper belonging to the Warden of the Fleet, before Bonner, 'who, *after his wonted manner of persuasion* going about to 'reduce him to his catholic church and the unity thereof; 'that is, from Christ to Antichrist; *sometimes with fair 'promises alluring, sometimes with menaces and terrors,* fearing 'him, etc.; to this William answering, said on this wise: ''Do what ye will, I am at a point; for the heavens shall as 'soon fall, as I will forsake mine opinion, etc.' Whereupon 'the bishop, after he had commanded these words to be 'registered, called for the depositions of certain witnesses;" and after they had been read, and the prisoner had been asked what he had to say against sentence being passed, and he had replied that he had nothing to say but what he had said, the sentence was passed, and it was carried into execution on the Wednesday after.

(16.) JOHN CARDMAKER. His history is somewhat obscure. It appears that he and Barlow had been brought before the Council in the Star Chamber, on the 9th of November; on which occasion he was committed to the Fleet[5]. That he was amongst those brought before the Commission on the 28th of January is clear; for Fox says "Cardmaker this day submitted himself unto them[6];" and he also says, referring to the same occasion, and respecting him and Barlow "they both made such an answer, as the Chancellor with his fellow commissioners allowed them for catholic[7]." That they really did so, seems sufficiently proved by their getting away without condemnation; but Fox, who seems to think that anything is better than the admission that any of the reformers recanted, or quailed, absurdly suggests "Whether they of 'weakness so answered, or he of subtlety would so under-'stand their answer, that he might have some *forged* example 'of a shrinking brother to lay in the dish of the rest, which 'were to be examined, it may easily be perceived by this, 'that *to all of them which followed in examination,* he objected 'the example of Barlow and Cardmaker, commending their 'soberness, discretion, and learning[8]." So then after all that we have heard of the bloodthirsty Chancellor's rabid zeal to destroy his victims, especially by striking (fairly or not) at

[5] Fox, vi. 562.
[6] Ibid. 588.
[7] Ibid. vol. vii. p. 78.
[8] Fox, vii. 78.

the higher sort, when a Bishop and a Prebendary made a bold, plain, and (on that day particularly) public, profession of the reformed faith, the crafty papist pretended to believe that they fully consented to rank popery, and would not understand anything else—and pretended that they had recanted, when they had done no such thing; and not only pretended this to the crowded audience before whom the examination had taken place, but stated it over and over again as a known fact to "all them which followed in examination"—that is to the friends of Barlow and Cardmaker, not one of whom, as far as I see, denied or even questioned it. There are few things liable to become so absurd and inconsistent, as party malice.

But though there can be no doubt that Cardmaker did submit, in such a way that his life was spared at that time, yet it seems as if it was either by some conditional arrangement, or else that he immediately got into fresh trouble; for when Laurence Saunders was excommunicated and sent to the Compter on the 30th of January, he found Cardmaker in confinement there[9]. He was probably kept as a prisoner either because he did not fulfil some promise of submission, or on account of some fresh matter; but, at all events, as Fox expresses it, he "remained there prisoner, to be baited 'of the papists, who would needs seem to have a certain hope 'that Cardmaker was become theirs. Continual and great 'conference divers of them had with him, with reasonings, 'persuadings, threatenings, and all to none effect." Dr. Martin, of whom we have heard before in the case of John Careless, was the "chief doer;" but it seems to have been all in vain, for the "papistical trash" which he had to offer, "Cardmaker answered largely, learnedly, and substantially." So the next things that we find in his history (though not before the 24th of May) are Articles ministered to him by Bonner; the first of which is, "that thou wast and art of the city and diocese of London, and so of the jurisdiction of me, Edmund, Bishop of London;" to which the sometime Prebendary of Wells "answereth and confesseth the same to be true in every part thereof."

I do not find anything else which shows that Bonner had to do with him. He suffered in Smithfield on the 30th of

[9] Fox, vii. 78.

May; and the only other fact which I observe respecting him is that "two or three days" before that time, "one Beard" called on him, professing that he came to him *from the Council*, to know whether he would recant.

(17.) JOHN WARNE, an upholsterer in Walbrook, appears to have been examined at the same time, and to have suffered on the same day, as Cardmaker; but to have had no other connection with him. According to the Articles ministered against him, which are given by Fox (he "confessing and granting the articles and contents thereof to be 'true, according as they were objected in every part; subscribing also the same with his hand") he was not only what the popish party would consider an old offender, but one of that class of mockers which have been already described. The fourth article was, "that thou hast said, that 'whereas about a twelvemonth ago, and more, a great rough 'water spaniel of thine was shorn in the head, and had a 'crown like a priest's made in the same, thou didst laugh at 'it and like it, though thou didst it not thyself, nor knewest 'who did it." Nobody will suppose this to have been the only thing of the sort in which John Warne was engaged; and if it was not very bad in itself, still there was something in it which was indicative of the *animus* of the man, and of the company which he kept. But another article shows us that he must have begun a course which brought him into notice, and trouble, at a very early age. He was, we are told, on this 23rd of May, 1555, only twenty-nine years of age; and it appears from one of the articles confessed by him, that he had been convented to the Guildhall for heresy under the Act of Six Articles, on the Thursday after the burning of Anne Askew, which must have been about nine years before the time of this present trouble, and when he could not have been more than twenty years of age. He seems to have married the widow of one Robert Lashford, a cutler[10], who must have been a good deal older than he was; as she had, at this time, a daughter by her former marriage, who was twenty years of age. The wife was one of the congregation of Thomas Rose, which was taken in Bow Church-yard on New Year's night, as has been already mentioned. Both she and her daughter suffered at a subsequent period; but

[10] Fox, vii. 749.

the history is at present confined to John Warne: and Fox lays the blame of his apprehension and punishment on Dr. Story, putting in a marginal note, "Story persecuteth his *kinsfolk*[1]," which of course keeps its place in the new edition, though Fox himself in another page of the same volume acknowledges his mistake and says, "I understand since of some, there was *no kindred* between them, but only that she was his servant[2]."

But as to John Warne, it seems that he could only be considered by the law as a relapsed heretic, seeing that the article which he subscribed states;—

"That thou, John Warne, wast in time past here, in the city of London, convented in the Guildhall for heresy against the sacrament of the altar, according to the order of the laws of this realm of England in the time of King Henry the Eighth, and when Alderman Barnes was sheriff, and the Thursday after that Anne Askew was burnt in Smithfield; and thereupon thou wast sent a prisoner to Newgate, to whom Edmund Bishop of London did repair with his chaplains, to instruct thee in the true faith of Christ, touching the said sacrament of the altar, and to bring thee from thy error, which was, that in the sacrament of the altar there is not the body of Christ, nor any corporal presence of Christ's body and blood, under the forms of bread and wine; but that in the said sacrament there is only material bread and wine, without any substance of Christ's body and blood at all: and because thou wouldst not leave and forsake thy said heresy therein, but persist and abide obstinately

[1] Fox, vii. p. 343.

[2] Fox, vii. 749. The passage in which Fox mentions the matter of Dr. Story in the earlier part of the volume, is characteristic of him and of his notion of "recognising" his book for different editions. "The chief 'procurer of this her death was Dr. Story, being (as it is thought) of some 'alliance either to her (the said Elizabeth), or else to her late husband: 'who, though he was, at the first apprehension of his said kinswoman, 'a very earnest suitor for her deliverance to Dr. Martin, then one of the 'king and queen's commissioners in matters of religion (himself being as 'yet not made commissioner), and had by his suit obtained her deliverance 'for that present, as Dr. Martin himself (the author hereof) hath reported; 'yet afterwards, upon what occasion God only knoweth, except upon 'some burning charity, the said Dr. Story, obtaining now the room of one 'of the commissioners, caused not only the said John Warne, but also his 'wife, and afterwards his daughter, to be again apprehended, never leav-'ing them until he had brought them all to ashes. Such was the rage of 'that devout Catholic and white child of the mother church, that neither 'kindred, nor any other consideration, could prevail with him, although 'it did (at his request) with others, who in respect of him were but 'strangers unto them. The Lord, if it be his will, turn his heart, or else 'rid his poor church from such a hydra, as, thanked be the Lord, now he 'hath."—*Fox*, vii. 343.

and wilfully therein, thou wert, according to the said laws, condemned to death and to be burnt; and thereupon labour being made for thee to the king and others in the court, thou hadst a pardon of King Henry the Eighth, and so thereby didst save thy life."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 80.

As to the proceedings against him when thus again accused, it is not worth while to repeat how the bishop was occupied in "*exhorting* him with many words to leave his heresies"—how at a subsequent examination "he was *earnestly exhorted* by the said bishop to recant his opinions"—how he was again examined and "the bishop then, seeing 'that notwithstanding all his *fair promises*, and *terrible* 'threatenings (*whereof he used store*), he could not anything 'prevail; finished this examination with the definitive sen-'tence." It is, I am aware, tiresome to repeat such matter as this so often; but without such repetition how can we judge of the real case? Could we without it sufficiently feel the palpable absurdity of representing the blood-thirsty bishop as a person foiled, and discomfited, and triumphed over, whenever a martyr resisted unto death? The bloody wolf seems to have saved John Warne's life once, and he wanted to do it again. But it would not do.

§ 6. BISHOP BONNER'S DEALINGS WITH THE COURT.

We are told that Bishop Bonner's proceedings with his prisoners were stimulated and quickened — though our account of them must be interrupted—by a letter which he received about this time, "directed from the court," and "sent by a post early in the morning." Fox heads it "A Letter from the King and Queen to Bonner," but as he could not himself, perhaps, view it, or wish his reader to consider it, otherwise than as a matter of confidential correspondence, and privy conspiracy, between the Queen and the bishop, he used the collateral security of a marginal note, "QUEEN MARY STIRRETH BONNER TO SHED INNOCENT BLOOD." This is of course enough for those who run over pages, and down margins, without inquiring whether the titles, and notes, agree with the text. But if anybody looks into the matter he will see that this was not a private and confidential note to Bonner from the Queen, but a document of a particularly public nature, under the sign manual. It will

be seen (for the matter is too important to our inquiry to allow of its being omitted) that it was a circular letter from the King and Queen to the bishops, informing them of their concern in another circular letter which had been already sent to all the Justices of the Peace in the kingdom.

"A Letter of the King and Queen to Bonner.

"To the right reverend father in God, our right trusty and well-beloved, the bishop of London.

"Right reverend father in God, right trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. And whereas of late we addressed our letters to the justices of peace within every of the counties of this our realm, whereby, amongst other instructions given them for the good order and quiet government of the country round about them, they are willed to have a special regard unto such disordered persons as (forgetting their duties towards God and us) do lean to any erroneous and heretical opinions, refusing to show themselves conformable to the catholic religion of Christ's church; wherein if they cannot by good admonitions and fair means reform them, they are willed to deliver them to the ordinary, to be by him charitably travailed withal, and removed (if it may be) from their naughty opinions; or else, if they continue obstinate, to be ordered according to the laws provided in that behalf: understanding now, to our no little marvel, that divers of the said disordered persons, being by the justices of peace, for their contempt and obstinacy, brought to the ordinaries to be used as is aforesaid, are either refused to be received at their hands, or, if they be received, are neither so travailed with as Christian charity requireth, nor yet proceeded withal according to the order of justice, but are suffered to continue in their errors, to the dishonour of Almighty God, and dangerous example of others; like as we find this matter very strange, so we have thought convenient both to signify this our knowledge, and therewith also to admonish you to have in this behalf such regard henceforth to the office of a good pastor and bishop, as when any such offenders shall be by the said officers or justices of peace brought unto you, you to use your good wisdom and discretion in procuring to remove them from their errors, if it may be; or else in proceeding against them (if they shall continue obstinate) according to the order of the laws; so as through your good furtherance, both God's glory may be better advanced, and the commonwealth more quietly governed.

"Given under our signet, at our honour of Hampton-court, the 24th of May, the first and second years of our reigns[3]."

This document is of great historical importance, as showing the conduct of the court at this time towards the ecclesiastical and civil authorities with reference to the matter of heresy. But it is of much more consequence in our

[3] Fox, vol. vii. p. 86.

inquiry; because, though it is absurd to talk of its being sent to Bonner personally, or as if it had any particular application to him, yet it was in fact sent to him as much as to the rest of the bishops; and our business is to inquire what *he* did with it. The reader may think this hopeless; for he will see that Fox, having given the document, proceeds with his story, dismissing the whole subject of court interference with this one remark;—"This letter coming 'from the court to the bishop, made him the more *earnest* 'and *hasty* to the condemnation, as well of others, as of 'these men of whom now we have presently to entreat, of 'John Simson I mean, and John Ardeley," &c.

We will, however, take leave to understand Fox's "presently" in the modern, rather than in his sense of the word; and first inquire what Bonner did with reference to this Royal Letter. In order to this an inquirer must have either the first edition of the Martyrology, or Mr. Cattley's. Taking for granted that he has not convenient access to the former very rare volume, I assume with equal confidence that he can consult the latter, which, owing to its badness and its being kept imperfect by the publisher, may be had at a very low price. If then he looks out the King and Queen's letter at volume vii. p. 86 of Mr. Cattley's edition, and proceeds to turn over exactly one hundred and ninety-nine pages, he will find a passage restored from the first edition, and stuck in (without a word of explanation or any reference but to that first edition) between "The Godly Letters of John Bradford," and the history of "William Minge," and having no sort of connection with either; but which, on reflection and comparison, he will see to be very important in regard to the subject of our inquiry. It begins thus;—

"In the month of May before, mention was made of certain letters directed from the king and the queen to Bonner, then being bishop of London. Besides which letters, certain others had been directed a little before from the Council to the said bishop; by occasion of which letters, Bonner, not long after, caused a certain declaration to be made at Paul's Cross, by Chedsey, unto the people, to purge and wash himself from the common and general suspicion of cruelty, which was spread abroad of him among the common people: the copy of which his declaration I thought here not to suppress, but, in this place, to set forth."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 285.

If I understand the matter right, Bonner received the

letter on Friday the 24th, or Saturday the 25th of May, and Dr. Chedsey made the following declaration on Sunday the 26th; "such quick speed" did Bonner make in doing what he saw fit to do on the occasion, and what certainly was rather a remarkable act; though I confess myself unable fully to understand tho whole motive and purpose of it. I shall, however, be surprised if I find, that any fair and candid person considers it as the act of a man who thirsted for blood, and desired nothing more than to drive on the persecution, and be the agent and instrument of its cruelties;—

"A Declaration made at Paules Crosse by Doctour Chedsey, at the commaundement of Boner, then Byshop of London.

"My lorde maior, maister aldermen, maister shiriffes, and all you here now assembled: my lorde byshoppe of London, your ordinarye, hath desired me to declare unto you all, that upon Friday last he dyd receive twoo letters from the court; the one came from the Kyng and Queenes majesties, the other from their majesties' privye Counsayle. The effect of that letter whiche came from the privye Counsell, was concerninge procession and prayer to be made for the obtaynyng and concludynge of peace betwene the Emperour's Majesty and the Frenche Kynge; the effect of that letter that came from the King and Queenes Majesties was for the charitable instruction and reformation for heretickes, if they would amend, and for theyr punishment if they woulde be wylfyll and obstinate; and you shall heare the tenour and woordes of both.

"The superscription of the letter commyng from the privye Counsell was thys: To our very good lorde the Byshop of London, wyth diligence. The subscription was: Your lordshyppes lovyng frendes, Francis Shrewesberye; Penbroke; Thomas Cheyny; Wylliam Peter; Thomas Wharton; Richard Southwel. The woordes of the bodye of the letter were these: After our ryght hartye, etc.

"The superscription of the letter comminge from the Kinge and Queenes Majesties was this: To the righte reverende Father in God, our right trustie and well beloved the byshop of London. The signe manuel was Philip and Marye: the tenor was Right reverend, etc.; and Lo, heare is the signet put to the saide letters.

"And where by these letters, comming from the king and Quenes Majesties, it appeareth that their majesties do charge my Lorde byshop of London and the rest of the bishops of remisnes and negligence in instructinge the people, infected with heresye, yf they will be taught, and in punishing them yf they will be obstinate and willfull, ye shall understand that my Lorde Byshop of London, for his part, offereth himselfe redye to do therin hys duty to the uttermost; gevinge you knowledge that he hath sent to all the prisons of the citie to knowe what persons are there for heresye, and by whose commaundement: and that he will travayle and take payne with all that be of his jurisdiction for theire amendement; and sorye he is that anye is in pryson for any such matter. And he

willed me to tel you, that he is not so cruell or hastye to sende men to pryson as some be slaunderous and wilful to do naught, and laye theire faultes on other men's shoulders.

"Moreover my sayd lord bishop willed me to declare unto you, that upon Wednisday next at eight of the clocke in the morning, there shall be heare at Paules a sermon before the generall procession; and, that sermon beynge done, there shal be a generall procession throughe this citye, according to the tenor of the counsail's letters; and I do warne here this assemblye, and, by them, al other of this citye, to be present at the same."—*Fox*, vol. vii. 286. First Ed. p. 1217.

This Declaration, as I have already stated, I do not fully understand; and I do not pretend to say who they were whom Bonner in so public a manner charged with doing naught and laying their faults on other men's shoulders. The whole passage was, I believe, omitted in every edition of Fox after the first, until it was restored by Mr. Cattley[4]; and this, whatever people may think of the story now, looks as if the martyrologist on reflection, or a hint from some wiser head than his own, thought that it was one which might as well be forgotten. I apprehend that we may be indebted to Mr. Cattley and his odd edition for a good many such particulars.

§ 7. BONNER'S DEALINGS WITH HIS OWN PRISONERS RESUMED.

Returning to the account of Bonner's dealings with his own prisoners, I am anxious to say at once, that it is not my purpose to weary the reader with a notice of each one of them in regular succession, though I have thought it fairest, most convenient, and every way best, to take a few of the first just in the order in which they occurred.

[4] As I have repeatedly said, I quote Mr. Cattley's edition for the convenience of my readers as well as for my own. It was however so evident that the unhappy editor had in this passage (as in others replaced by him from the first edition) *in*corrected it into nonsense, that I did not venture to do what can be of comparatively little consequence where the reader may refer to older editions. Through the kindness of my friend Mr. Holmes of the Museum I am enabled to give it as it stands in the first edition. Mr. Cattley not understanding the end of the third paragraph, has printed it thus, "he is not so cruel or hasty to send men to prison as some be — slanderous and wilful to do naught, and lay their faults on other men's shoulders." This might indicate something omitted, but it is not so. It is merely that the editor did not understand it. It is obvious that there should be a comma after "prison."

I can truly declare that if I were merely desirous to make out a case, and it could be done without intolerable prolixity and repetition, I should be glad to go regularly through all the processes in which Bonner was concerned; and that, if I feel it necessary to select a part only, not a single one is omitted from a fear that it would contradict any fact which is stated, or any opinion which is maintained, in this volume.

But, in truth, the cases, as they are reported to us, are chiefly of two kinds; namely, those which relate little more than the capture of the prisoner, his examinations, his constancy in maintaining his opinions and withstanding the flattering and threatening by which he was assailed, and the catastrophe which followed—these accounts, given on one authority or another, or perhaps on none at all, form one class. The other, and much more valuable, consists of those narratives which were written by the parties themselves or their immediate relations or friends. These are not only more circumstantial, and more graphic, but, what is still more important, they are plainly the most unexceptionable as it regards both the facts stated, and the *animus* of the parties most interested. The reporter, we are sure, does not write to eulogize Bonner, or dispraise the subject of his narrative.

The two cases which occur next after the interruption of the Royal Letter, are fair specimens of this. The first is the joint one, already mentioned, of;—

(18.) JOHN SIMSON, and (19.) JOHN ARDELEY. They were both husbandmen in the town of Wigborough in Essex. At some time, which is not stated, they were "brought up both together by the under-sheriff of Essex to Bonner, Bishop of London, upon the accusation (as in that time it was called) of heresy[5].". Afterwards (how long of course does not appear, but it was on the 22nd of May, 1555) articles were objected to them. They answered either on the same day or on some other, and then, "the bishop, according to the old trade of his consistory court, respited them to the afternoon.". At that time he repeated the said articles to them, "and beginning with John 'Ardeley, did urge and solicitate him, according to his 'manner of words, to recant. To whom John Ardeley

[5] Fox, vii. 86, 88.

'again, constantly standing to his professed religion, gave 'answer in words as followeth: 'My lord,' quoth he, ''neither you, nor any other of your religion, is of the 'catholic church; for you be of a false faith: and I doubt 'not but you shall be deceived at length, bear as good a face 'as ye can. Ye will shed the innocent blood, and you have 'killed many, and yet go about to kill more, etc.'"

When a husbandman of Essex, aged thirty, was thus publicly addressing the Bishop of London, sitting as a judge in his court, it is more natural to wonder at the patience which bore with it, than to blame the mistaken and impotent good-will that still persisted in endeavours to procure an abjuration; and it is not necessary for us to enter into the further particulars of the case. It is more to the purpose to notice that of,—

(20.) THOMAS HAUKES, gentleman, who tells his own story[6], with many very interesting particulars, and with a degree of self-complacency, and undisguised abomination of all papistry, which make his testimony respecting Bonner's temper, and mode of dealing with a rather provoking prisoner, particularly worthy of attention. I sincerely wish the reader would study the whole of it; for I believe it was the reading of this case, many years ago, which first raised in my own mind a suspicion that the bishop was not altogether such a person as Fox and some others would have us suppose him to have been. I could not avoid feeling that the young man, vaunted of by Fox as one who might "seem to nobilitate the whole company of other holy mar-'tyrs, and as a bright star to make the church of God and 'his truth, of themselves bright and clear, more gloriously 'to shine by his example," was, in his conduct and carriage, very unlike a humble Christian; while I could not escape the impression, that within the rough exterior of the bishop there must have been something more or less resembling that charity which is not easily provoked, nay even suffereth long, and is kind. Such an effect must, I think, be produced by the study of the history in Fox; and perhaps a few extracts, if they do nothing more, may show what I mean; though of course the prolixity, and repetition, which we are anxious and constrained to avoid, is a very impor-

[6] Fox, vii. p. 97.

want feature in the case. It is not that the bishop let a forward young man say his say out, once or even twice, and then despatched him; but, that, after such a beginning, he had him on his hands for near a twelvemonth.

It seems that Thomas Haukes "entered service with the Earl of Oxford" (in a way which does not preclude his being qualified as "gentleman" in his history) during the preceding reign; and that when, on the change of religion, his patron conformed, he was not so accommodating, but quitted the Earl's service and lived at home. "But," says Fox, "what paradise[7] in this world shall a man find so secret for 'himself, whither that old wicked serpent' [the law of the 'land, I suppose] 'cannot creep, whereby he may have some 'matter to overthrow the quietness of the godly?" From what I can learn of Thomas Haukes' character I should not think that he was a person who concealed his opinions, or wished particularly for shade and secrecy; but Fox proceeds:—

"Now in the mean season (as it happened) Haukes, keeping his house at home, had born unto him a young son, whose baptism was deferred to the third week, for that he would not suffer him to be baptized after the papistical manner; which thing the adversaries not able to suffer, laying hands upon him, did bring him to the earl of Oxford, there to be reasoned with, as not sound in religion, in that he seemed to contemn the sacraments of the church.

"The earl, either intending not to trouble himself in such matters or else seeing himself not able to weigh with him in such cases of religion, sent him up to London with a messenger, and letters; and so, willing to clear his own hands, put him in the hands of Bonner, bishop of London; the contents of which his letter sent to Bonner be these.

"A Letter of the Earl of Oxford to Bonner.

"Most reverend father in God, be it known unto you, that I have sent you one Thomas Haukes, dwelling in the County of Essex, who hath a child that hath remained unchristened more than three

[7] So it stands in Mr. Cattley's edition, and perhaps correctly; for I have not the edition of 1583 which he professed to follow. The edition of 1597, which I suppose to be the best text of the Martyrology, reads "place" instead of "paradise," and it is followed by the edition of 1641, the only other black letter edition to which I can conveniently refer. These editions furnish other various readings in the account of Thomas Haukes, some of which will be noticed as they occur. Of course I shall not be understood as representing the two editions as of equal authority, having already said that I suppose the earliest of them to contain the best text that exists.

weeks; who, being upon the same examined, hath denied to have it baptized as it is now used in the church; whereupon I have sent him to your good lordship, to use as ye think best, by your good discretion."—vii. 98.

Soon after this we meet with a "Private Talk or Conference between Haukes and Bonner," in which after some introductory conversation about the baptism of his child, and other matter, Bonner inquired whether he knew Knight and Pygot, and the conversation proceeded thus:—

"*Haukes.* 'Knight I know, but Pygot I do not know.'

"*Bonner.* 'I thought ye were acquainted with him: it seemeth so by your judgment. What preachers do ye know in Essex?'

"*Haukes.* 'I know none.'

"*Bonner.* 'Do ye not know one Baget there?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yes forsooth, I know him.'

"*Bonner.* 'What manner of man is he?'

"*Haukes.* 'An honest man, so far as I know.'

"*Bonner.* 'Do you know him if you see him?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yea, that I do.'

"Then said he to one of his servants, 'Go call me Baget hither.' And then he said to me, 'You seem to be a very proud man, and a stubborn.'—He that brought me up stood all this while by.

"*Haukes.* 'What should move your lordship so to say?'

"*Bonner.* 'Because I see in a man that came with you, much humility and lowliness.'

"*Haukes.* 'It seemeth your lordship speaketh that to me, because I make no courtesy[9] to you:'—and with that came Baget. Then the bishop said to Baget: 'How say ye, Sir? know ye this man?'

"*Baget.* 'Yea forsooth, my lord:'—with that Baget and I shook hands. Then said the bishop to Baget, 'Sir, this man hath a child which hath lain three weeks unchristened (as I have letters to show); who refuseth to have it baptized, as it is now used in the church:—how say you thereto?'

"*Baget.* 'Forsooth, my lord, I say nothing thereto,' [with low courtesy to the hard ground.]

"*Bonner.* 'Say you nothing thereto? I will make you tell me whether it be laudable, and to be frequented and used in the church or not.'

"*Baget.* 'I beseech your lordship to pardon me: he is old enough; let him answer for himself.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ah, sir knave! are ye at that point with me?' 'Go call me the porter,' said he, to one of his men: 'Thou shalt sit in the stocks, and have nothing but bread and water. I perceive I have kept you too well. Have I made thus much of you, and have I you at this point?'

---

[8] Rector of Fordham since 1554; which he seems to have held until 1558.—*Newcourt.*

[9] "No more courtesy," ed. 1597.

"Then came the bishop's man, and said, 'The porter is gone to London:' then said the bishop to Baget, 'Come with me,' and he went away with him, and commanded me away, and bade one of his gentlemen to talk with me (who was one of his own teaching) who desired, amongst other [10] things, to know of me, with whom I was acquainted in Essex, and what men they were, that were my teachers.

"*Haukes.* 'When I see your commission I will make you answer.' —And then immediately came the bishop again: but ere he came, his man and I had much talk. Then the bishop sat down under a vine in his orchard, and called Baget to him, whom he carried away, and brought again; and called me also, and said to Baget: 'How say ye now, sir, unto baptism? Say whether it be to be frequented and used in the church, as it is now, or no?'

"*Baget.* Forsooth my lord, I say it is good.'

"*Bonner.* 'I befool your heart; could ye not have said so before? Ye have wounded this man's conscience.' Then the bishop turned to me and said, 'How say ye now, sir? This man is turned and converted.'

"*Haukes.* 'I build my faith neither upon this man, neither upon you, but only upon Christ Jesus; who (as Paul saith) is the founder and author of all men's faith.'

"*Bonner.* 'I perceive ye are a stubborn fellow. I must be glad to work another way with you, to win you.'

"*Haukes.* 'Whatsoever ye do, I am ready to suffer it: for I am in your hands to abide it.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, ye are so; come on your ways; ye shall go in, and I will use you christianlike: you shall have meat and drink, such as I have in my house: but in any wise talk not.'

"*Haukes.* 'I purpose to talk nothing but the word of God and truth.'

"*Bonner.* 'I will have no heresy talked on in my house.'

"*Haukes.* 'Why, is the truth become heresy? God hath commanded that we should have none other talk in our houses, in our beds, at our meat, and by the way, but all truth.'

"*Bonner.* 'If ye will have my favour, be ruled by my counsel.'

"*Haukes.* 'Then I trust you will grant me my request.'

"*Bonner.* 'What is that?'

"*Haukes.* 'That your doctors and servants give me none occasion: for if they do, I will surely utter my conscience.'

"Then commanded he his men to take in Baget, and let not Haukes and him talk together. And so thus we departed, and went to dinner; and I dined at the steward's table. After dinner, his chaplains and his men began to talk with me. But amongst all others, there was one Darbishire, principal of Broadgates in Oxford, and the bishop's kinsman, who said to me, that I was too curious; 'for ye will have,' said he, 'nothing but your little pretty God's book.'

"*Haukes.* 'And is it not sufficient for my salvation?' 'Yes,

[10] "Amongst all other," ed. 1597.

said Darbishire, 'it is sufficient for our salvation, but not for our instruction.'

"*Haukes.* 'God send me the salvation and you the instruction.' And as we thus reasoned, came the bishop, who said unto me, 'I gave you a commandment, that you should not talk.'

"*Haukes.* 'And I desired you, that your doctors and servants should give me none occasion.' Then went we into his orchard again, he and his doctors and I."—vii. 99.

The Bishop then enquired, whether he would have any objection to have his child christened according to King Edward's book; and, on his stating that such was his desire, the Bishop endeavoured to convince him that the forms were the same as to what was essential. After this he asked:—

"*Bonner.* 'Will ye be content to tarry here, and your child shall be baptized, and you shall not know of it, so that you will agree to it?'

"*Haukes.* 'If I would so have done, I needed not to have come to you: for I had the same counsel given before.'

"*Bonner.* 'You seem to be a lusty young man; you will not give your head for the washing; you will stand in the defence of it for the honour of your country. Do you think that the queen and I cannot command it to be done, in spite of your teeth?'

"*Haukes.* 'What the queen and you can do, I will not stand in it: but ye get my consent never the sooner.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, you are a stubborn young man: I perceive I must work another way with you.'

"*Haukes.* 'Ye are in the hands of God; and so am I.'

"*Bonner.* 'Whatsoever you think, I will not[1] have you speak such words unto me.'—And so we departed until evensong time; and ere evensong was begun, my lord called for me to come to him into the chapel, and said; 'Haukes! thou art a proper young man, and God hath done his part unto thee; I would be glad to do thee good. Thou knowest that I am thy pastor, and one that should answer for thee. If I would not teach thee well, I should answer for thy soul.'

"*Haukes.* 'That I have said, I will stand to it, God willing: there is no way to remove it.'

"*Bonner.* 'Nay, nay, Haukes, thou shalt not be so wilful. Remember Christ bade two go into his vineyard: the one said would, and went not; the other said he would not, and went.'

"*Haukes.* 'The last went.'

"*Bonner.* 'Do thou likewise, and I will talk friendly with thee.'"—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 101.

After some talk on part of the sixth chapter of the gospel of St. John, which issued in the bishop's saying, "I trust that you be sound in the blessed sacrament," and Haukes's

[1] "I would not," both ed

answering, "I beseech your lordship to feel my conscience no further than in that, that I was accused in unto you." To this Bonner answered:—

"*Bonner.* 'Well, well! let us go unto evensong.'—With that I turned my back to go out of the chapel.

"*Bonner.* 'Why, will you not tarry evensong?'

"*Haukes.* 'No, forsooth.'

"*Bonner.* 'And why?'

"*Haukes.* 'For I will not.'

"*Bonner.* 'And why will ye not?'

"*Haukes.* 'For because I have no edifying thereby, for I understand no Latin.'

"*Bonner.* 'Why? you may pray by yourself. What books have ye?'

"*Haukes.* 'I have the New Testament, the books of Solomon, and the Psalter.'

"*Bonner.* 'Why, I pray you, tarry here, and pray you on your Psalter.'

"*Haukes.* 'I will not pray in this place, nor in any such.'

"Then said one of his chaplains, 'Let him go, my lord; and he shall be no partaker with us in our prayers.'

"*Haukes.* 'I think myself best at ease when I am furthest from you.'—And so the bishop went to evensong, and I came down and walked between the hall and the chapel in the court, and tarried there till evensong was done. And within an hour after that evensong was done, the bishop sent for me into his chamber where he lay himself; and when I came, there was he, and three of his chaplains."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 101.

A conversation then ensued on the sacrament; and, after a while, Haukes having spoken of the manner in which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper began, Bonner said,—

"*Bonner.* 'Alas, you know not how it began, neither of the institution thereof.'

"*Haukes.* 'Then I would be glad to learn.

"*Bonner.* 'Marry, we will teach you: but you are so stubborn that ye will not learn.'

"*Haukes.* 'Except ye learn me by the word of God, I will never credit you, nor believe you:' and thus we concluded. Then the bishop and his chaplains laughed and said, 'Jesu, Jesu! what a stubbornness and arrogantness is this!' And this was in his chamber where he lay. Then said the bishop to me, 'Go down, and drink; for it is fasting day: it is Midsummer Even, but I think ye love neither fasting nor praying.'

"*Haukes.* 'I will never deny fasting, neither praying; so that it be done as it ought to be done, and without hypocrisy or vain glory.'

"*Bonner.* 'I like you the better for that:' and so we left for that night.

"The next day the bishop went to London: for Fecknam was

made dean that day, and I tarried still at Fulham. Then did the bishop's men desire me to come to mass, but I did utterly refuse it, answering them as I did their master. That night the bishop came home to Fulham again."—vii. 102.

There is one trait in Bonner's character which has been already brought before us, but which deserves a more specific notice. That he was a man of considerable talent, his being employed in public business so much as he was by those who so well knew how to choose their agents seems to prove—that he was more than usually learned in ecclesiastical and civil law is admitted—and I know of no reason why we should suppose that he was not as well able as most of his brethren to defend the opinions which they maintained. But, as to the matter of fact, though he seems not to have avoided entering the lists as a theological polemic when it either fell naturally, or was forced, upon him, yet he appears always to have been anxious to get others to talk with his prisoners, under an idea that they might persuade and convince where he could not[2]. This habit led the bishop very early on the Monday morning to introduce his prisoner to his chaplain, and gave rise to the "Talk between Harpsfield and Thomas Haukes," which will be found in Fox, and which the disappointed bishop at length put an end to.

"Then the bishop said to Harpsfield, 'Sir, ye see this man hath no need of our Lady, neither of any of the blessed saints. Well! I will trouble you no longer. I did call you, hoping that you should do some good on him; but it will not be.'—And he said to me, 'Sir, it is time to begin with you. We will rid you away, and then we shall have one heretic less.'

"*Harpsfield.* 'What books have you?'

"*Haukes.* 'The New Testament, Solomon's Books, and the Psalter.'

"*Harpsfield.* 'Will you read any other books?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yea, if you will give me such books as I will require.'

"*Harpsfield.* 'What books will you require?'

---

[2] The reader will remember the article already referred to at p. 359, being the seventh of those ministered to Pygot, Knight, and Laurence, in which it was enquired whether they had not been instructed and informed as well by the bishop's ordinary and chaplains, as also by "divers other learned men, some whereof were bishops, some deans, and some archdeacons, and every one of them learned in divinity," &c.—*Fox*, vi. 738. Some other indications of this practice the reader may have gathered from this volume; and he may find enough proof of it in the Martyrology.

"*Haukes.* 'Latimer's books, my lord of Canterbury's book, Bradford's Sermons, Ridley's books.'

"*Bonner.* 'Away, away! He will have no books but such as maintain his heresies:'—and so they departed, for Harpsfield was booted to ride unto Oxford; and I went to the porter's lodge again."—*Fox*, vii. 104.

The next day Bird, who had been Bishop of Chester, being at Fulham, the same habit led Bonner to introduce his prisoner to him:—

"The next day's Talk.

"The next day came hither an old bishop, who had a pearl in his eye; and he brought with him to my lord a dish of apples, and a bottle of wine. For he had lost his living, because he had a wife. Then the bishop called me again into the orchard, and said to the old bishop: 'this young man hath a child, and will not have it christened.'

"*Haukes.* 'I deny not baptism.'

"*Bonner.* 'Thou art a fool; thou canst not tell what thou wouldest have;'—and that he spake with much anger.

"*Haukes.* 'A bishop must be blameless or faultless, sober, discreet, no chider, nor given to anger.'

"*Bonner.* 'Thou judgest me to be angry: no, by my faith, am I not.'—and stroke himself upon the breast.

"Then said the old bishop, 'Alas, good young man! you must be taught by the church, and by your ancients; and do as your forefathers have done before you.'

"*Bonner.* 'No, no! he will have nothing but the Scriptures, and God wot, he doth not understand them. He will have no ceremonies in the church, no not one. What say you to holy water?'" &c.—vii. 104.

After a good deal of further discourse, in which Haukes had declared that he would "believe no doctrine, but that which is wrought by miracles," and had referred to the signs promised to those that should believe, Bonner asked;—

"*Bonner.* 'With what new tongues do ye speak?'

"*Haukes.* 'Forsooth, whereas, before that I came to the knowledge of God's word I was a foul blasphemer, and filthy talker, since I came to the knowledge thereof, I have lauded God, praised God, and given thanks unto God even with the same tongue: and is not this a new tongue?'

"*Bonner.* 'How do you cast out devils?'

"*Haukes.* 'Christ did cast them out by his word; and he hath left the same word, that whosoever doth credit and believe it, shall cast out devils.'

"*Bonner.* 'Did you ever drink any deadly poison?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yea, forsooth, that I have; for I have drunken of the pestilent traditions and ceremonies of the bishop of Rome.'

"*Bonner.* 'Now you shew yourself to be a right heretic.'

"*Haukes.* 'I pray you, what is heresy?'

"*Bonner.* 'All things that are contrary to God's word.'

"*Haukes.* 'If I stand in any thing contrary thereto, then am I worthy to be so called.'

"*Bonner.* 'Thou art one; and thou shalt be burned, if thou stand and continue in this opinion. Ye think we are afraid to put one of you to death: yes, yes, there is a brotherhood of you, but I will break it, I warrant you.'

"*Haukes.* 'Where prove you that Christ or his apostles did kill any man for his faith?'

"*Bonner.* 'Did not Paul excommunicate?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yes, my lord; but there is a great difference between excommunicating and burning.'

"*Bonner.* 'Have you not read of the man and the woman in the Acts of the Apostles, whom Peter destroyed?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yes, forsooth; I have read of one Ananias, and Sapphira his wife, which were destroyed for lying against the Holy Ghost, which serveth nothing to your purpose.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, you will grant one yet.'

"*Haukes.* 'Well, if you will have us to grant you be of God, then shew mercy; for that God requireth.'

"*Bonner.* 'We will shew such mercy unto you, as ye showed unto us: for my benefice or bishopric was taken away from me, so that I had not one penny to live upon.'

"*Haukes.* 'I pray ye, my lord, what do you give him now that was in the bishopric or benefice before that ye came again to it?'—Whereunto he answered me never a word; for he turned his back unto me, and talked with other men, saying, that he was very sorry for me, but he trusted that I would turn with St. Paul, because I was so earnest: and so he departed, and went to dinner, and I to the porter's lodge again. After dinner I was called into the hall again, and the bishop desired the old bishop to take me into his chamber: 'for I would be glad,' said he, 'if ye could convert him.' So he took me into his chamber, and sat him down in a chair, and said to me, 'I would to God I could do you some good. Ye are a young man, and I would not wish you to go too far, but learn of your elders to bear somewhat.'

"*Haukes.* 'I will bear with nothing that is contrary to the word of God.' And I looked that the old bishop should have made me an answer, and he was fast asleep.—Then I departed out of the chamber alone, and went to the porter's lodge again, and there saw I the old bishop last: I suppose he is not yet awake."—vii. 105.

The next thing, happening the next day, and obviously brought about by the same custom, is a "Talk between Fecknam and Haukes;" and the next to that, on the day following, a "Talk between Haukes and Chedsey," which is thus introduced:—

"The next day came Dr. Chedsey to the bishop; and then was I called into the garden to the bishop and him. The bishop declared unto him, that I had stood stubbornly in the defence against the

christening of my child, and against the ceremonies of the church, and that I would not have it christened but in English.

"Then said Dr. Chedsey, 'Then he denieth the order of the catholic church.'

"*Bonner.* 'Yea, he thinketh that there is no church but in England and in Germany.'

"*Haukes.* 'And ye think that there is no church, but the church of Rome.'

"*Chedsey.* 'What say ye to the church of Rome?'

"*Haukes.* 'I say it is a church of a sort of vicious cardinals, priests, monks, and friars, which I will never credit nor believe.'

"*Chedsey.* 'How say ye to the bishop of Rome?'

"*Haukes.* 'From him and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us.'

"*Chedsey.* 'Marry, so may we say, from king Henry the Eighth, and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us.'

"*Haukes.* 'Where were ye whiles that he lived, that ye would not say so?'

"*Chedsey.* 'I was not far.'

"*Haukes.* 'Where were ye in his son's days?'

"*Chedsey.* 'In prison.'

"*Haukes.* 'It was not for your well doing.'

"*Bonner.* 'He will by no means come within my chapel, nor hear mass: for neither the mass, neither the sacrament of the altar, can he abide, neither will he have any service but in English.'"—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 107.

Much talk they had which it is not to our purpose to extract, but Chedsey having spoken of rejoicing in the cross of Christ in a way which seemed to Haukes to imply that the Apostle meant the material cross, and Haukes having answered "Do ye understand Paul so? Do ye understand Paul? unto which," says Haukes, "he answered me never a word," the bishop struck in—

"*Bonner.* 'Where can we have a godlier remembrance when we ride by the way, than to see the cross?'

"*Haukes.* 'If the cross were such a profit unto us, why did not Christ's disciples take it up, and set it on a pole, and carry it in procession, with "Salve, festa dies?"'

"*Chedsey.* 'It was taken up.'

"*Haukes.* 'Who took it up? Helene, as ye say; for she sent a piece of it to a place of religion, *where I was with the visitors when that house was suppressed*[3], and the piece of the holy cross (which the religious had in such estimation, and had robbed many a soul, committing idolatry to it) was called for; and when it was proved, and

[3] This passage is worthy of notice as furnishing a little light respecting the previous conditions of Thomas Haukes; a point on which he and Fox are not very communicative.

all come to all, it was but a piece of a lath, covered over with copper, double gilded as it had been clean gold!'

"*Bonner.* 'Fie, fie! I dare say thou slanderest it.'

"*Haukes.* 'I know it to be true, and do not believe the contrary.'—And thus did the bishop and the doctor depart in a great fume: and Chedsey said unto me, as he was about to depart, 'It is pity that thou shouldest live, or any such as thou art.' I answered, 'In this case I desire not to live, but rather to die.'

"*Chedsey.* 'Ye die boldly, because ye would glory in your death, as Joan Butcher did.'

"*Haukes.* 'What Joan Butcher did, I have nothing to do withal: but I would my part might be to-morrow.'—'God make you in a better mind,' said they both; and so they departed, and I went to the porter's lodge with my keeper. The next day Dr. Chedsey preached in the bishop's chapel, and did not begin his sermon until all the service was done: and then came the porter for me, and said 'My lord would have you come to the sermon.'—And so I went to the chapel-door, and stood without the door.

"*Bonner.* 'Is not this fellow come?'

"*Haukes.* 'Yes, I am here.'

"*Bonner.* 'Come in, man.'

"*Haukes.* 'No, that I will not.' He called again, and I answered, 'I will come no nearer;' and so I stood at the door. Then said the bishop, 'Go to your sermon.'—vii. 108.

The same day there was "Another Communication between Thomas Haukes and the Bishop." The former says;—

"And, after dinner, I was called into the chapel, where were certain of the queen's servants, and other strangers whom I did not know[4].

"*Bonner.* 'Haukes! how like you the sermon?'

"*Haukes.* 'As I like all the rest of his doctrine.'

"*Bonner.* 'What! are ye not edified thereby?'

"*Haukes.* 'No, surely.'

"*Bonner.* 'It was made only because of you.'

"*Haukes.* 'Why? then am I sorry that ye had no more heretics here, as ye call them: I am sorry that ye have bestowed so much labour on one, and so little regarded.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, I will leave you here, for I have business: I pray you talk with him, for if ye could do him good,' said he, 'I would be glad.'

"This the bishop spake to the queen's men, who said unto me, 'Alas! what mean you to trouble yourself about such matters against the queen's proceedings?'

"*Haukes.* 'Those matters have I answered before them that be in authority: and unless I see you have a further commission, I will answer you nothing at all.' Then said the bishop's men (which were many), 'My lord hath commanded you to talk with them.'

[4] "I did know," both ed.

"*Haukes.* 'If my lord will talk with me himself, I will answer him.' They cried, 'Faggots! burn him, hang him, to prison with him: it is a pity that he liveth! Lay irons upon him!' and with a great noise they spake these words. Then in the midst of all their rage I departed from them, and went to the porter's lodge again.'—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 109.

Again,

"The next day the bishop called me into his chamber, and said, 'Ye have been with me a great while, and ye are never the better, but worse and worse: and therefore I will delay the time no longer, but send you to Newgate.'

"*Haukes.* 'My lord, you can do me no better pleasure.'

"*Bonner.* 'Why, would you so fain go to prison?'

"*Haukes.* 'Truly I did look for none other, when I came to your hands.'

"*Bonner.* 'Come on your ways; ye shall see what I have written.' —Then did he shew me certain articles, and these are the contents of them."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 109.

Then they discoursed somewhat on the Articles in question, and Haukes says, "Then did the Bishop with much flattery counsel me to be persuaded, and to keep me out of prison, which I utterly refused, and so we departed." He does not appear to have had any farther communication with the bishop until the next day, or the day after; but he proceeds in a way well worthy our attention, not only as more fully showing the nature and temper of the prisoner whom the bishop had to deal with, but the bishop's own opinion of him as to points on which he is perfectly silent himself, and which no doubt influenced Bonner, though he did not wish to burn him, nor to suffer him to go at large.

"The next day in the morning, which was the 1st day of July, the bishop did call me himself from the porter's lodge, commanding me to make me ready to go to prison, and to take such things with me, as I had of mine own. And I said, 'I do neither intend to bribe, neither to steal, God willing.' Then he did write my warrant to the keeper of the Gatehouse at Westminster, and delivered it to Harpsfield, who, with his own man and one of the bishop's men, brought me to prison, and delivered the warrant, and me, both to the keeper: and this was contained in the warrant.

"'I will and command you, that you receive him who cometh named in this warrant, and that he be kept as a safe prisoner, and that no man speak with him, and that ye deliver him to no man, except it be the council, or to a justice: for he is a sacramentary, and one that speaketh against baptism; a seditious man, a perilous man to be abroad in these perilous days.'

"And thus was I received, and they departed. And there I remained thirteen days, and then the bishop sent two of his men

unto me, saying, 'My lord would be glad to know how ye do.' I answered them, 'I do, like a poor prisoner.' They said, 'My lord would know, whether ye be the same man that ye were when ye departed.' I said, 'I am no changeling.' They said, 'My lord would be glad that ye should do well.' I said, 'If my lord will me any good, I pray you desire him to suffer my friends to come to me.' So they said they would speak for me, but I heard no more of them.

"This is the first examination of me Thomas Haukes, being examined by Edmund Bonner, then bishop of London, and by his chaplains and doctors at Fulham, four miles from London, where I lay, till I came to prison to Westminster: and after his two men had been with me, I heard no more of him till the 3d day of September."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 110.

Then Thomas Haukes was sent for by the bishop of London, and the Keeper of the prison and his men brought him to the bishop's palace. He begins his account thus;—

"The bishop of Winchester, then being chancellor, preached that day at Paul's Cross, and the bishop of London said to my keeper, 'I think your man will not go to the sermon to day.'

"*Haukes.* 'Yes my lord, I pray you let me go: and that which is good I will receive, and the rest I will leave behind me;' and so I went. And when the sermon was done, I and my keeper came to the bishop's house, and there we remained till dinner was done; and after dinner the bishop called for me, and asked me, if I were the same man that I was before.

"*Haukes.* 'I am no changeling, nor none will be.

"*Bonner.* 'Ye will find me no changeling neither.'—And so he returned into his chamber, and there he did write the side of a sheet of paper.—*Fox*, vii. 111.

There seems to have been a great number of persons present; and while Bonner was writing his side of a sheet of paper, Haukes remained and talked with Dr. Smith, and also held the conversation with Miles Hoggard which has been already mentioned at p. 234 of this volume. The discourse and the way of relating it, are exceedingly characteristic as it regards Haukes; but our concern is more with Bonner than with the prisoner, whose confession he seems to have been preparing for signature. He was so long about it that Thomas Haukes became somewhat tired of the company, who wished to dispute with him, and urged him until he told them that he would not talk "with any man more." "I said," he tells us, "that I came to talk with my Lord and not with any of them;"

"With that came the bishop, bringing a letter in his hand, the which he had written in my name, and read it unto me after this

manner. 'I, Thomas Haukes, do here confess and declare before my said ordinary Edmund, bishop of London, that the mass is abominable and detestable, and full of all superstition; and also as concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ (commonly called the sacrament of the altar) that Christ is in no part thereof, but only in heaven: this I have believed, and this I do believe,' &c.

"*Haukes.* 'Stop there, my lord: what I have believed, what have you to do withal? But what I do believe, to that stand I, and will.' —Then he took his pen, and said he would scrape it out for my pleasure, and so he did[5] to my thinking.

"Then he went further with his writing, and said, 'I Thomas Haukes, have talked with my said Ordinary, and with certain good, godly, and learned men. Notwithstanding I stand still in mine opinion.'

"*Haukes.* 'Shall I grant you to be good, godly, and learned men, and yet grant myself to stand in a contrary opinion? No, I will not grant you to be good, godly, and learned men.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ye will grant that ye have talked with us: the other I will put out for your pleasure.' Then said all his doctors, 'If your lordship be ruled by him, he will cause you to put out all together.' And then he read more to me: 'Here unto this bill have I set my hand;' and then he offered me the bill and his pen, and bade me set my hand to it.

"*Haukes,* 'Ye get not my hand to any thing of your making or devising.'

"*Bonner.* 'Wilt not thou set to thy hand? It shall be to thy shame for the denying of it."

"And then he called all his doctors, and said, he would have every man's hand to it that was in the chamber; and so he had all their hands to it and said, 'He that will not set his hand to it, I would he were hanged;' and so said all his chaplains and doctors with a great noise.

"Then the bishop thrust me on the breast with great anger; and said he would be even with me, and with all such proud knaves in Essex.

"*Haukes.* 'Ye shall do no more than God shall give you leave.'

"*Bonner.* 'This gear shall not be unpunished—trust to it.'

"*Haukes.* 'As for your cursings, railings, and blasphemings, I care not for them: for I know the moths and worms shall eat you, as they eat cloth or wool.'

"*Bonner.* 'I will be even with you when time shall come.'

"*Haukes.* 'You may in your malice destroy a man: but, when ye have done, ye cannot do so much as make a finger; and ye be meetly even with some of us already.'

"*Bonner.* 'If I do thee any wrong, take the law of me.'

"*Haukes.* 'Solomon saith, Go not to law with a judge; for he will judge according to his own honour.'

"*Bonner.* 'Solomon saith, Give not a fool an answer.'

"*Haukes.* 'What! do you count me a fool?'

---

[5] "So did," both ed.

"*Bonner.* 'Yea, by my troth do I; and so dost thou me too: but God forgive thee, and so do I.'

"*Haukes.* 'Thought is free my lord.' Then took Bonner the bill, and read it again; and when he saw that he could not have my hand to it, then he would have had me to take it into my hand, and to give it to him again.

"*Haukes.* 'What needeth that ceremony? Neither shall it come into my hand, heart, or mind.' Then he wrapt it up, and put in his bosom, and in a great anger went his way, and called for his horse and went to horse-back; for the same day he rode in visitation into Essex. And so went I to prison, from whence I came with my keeper. And this was the second time of my examination."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 112.

Let me remind the reader that all he has read passed more than five months before the time when Bishop Burnet represents Haukes as being "apprehended;" and I may add that during that long period there is, as far as I can find, a complete blank in his history. At least, all the information which I have been able to collect, beside what is already given, is contained in the following extract:—

"After all these private conferences, persuasions, and long debatings, had with Thomas Haukes in the bishop's house, as hitherto hath been declared, the bishop, seeing no hope to win him to his wicked ways, was fully set to proceed openly against him after the ordinary course of his popish law. Whereupon Thomas Haukes, shortly after, was cited with the rest of his other fellows above specified, to wit, Thomas Tomkins, Stephen Knight, William Pygot, John Laurence, and William Hunter, to appear in the bishop's Consistory, the 8th day of February, this present year, *viz.* 1555. Upon which appearance, was laid against him in like order as to the other, first the bill of his confession, written with Bonner's hand, to the which bill ye heard before how this blessed servant of God denied to subscribe.

"After which bill of confession being read, and he constantly standing to the said confession, the bishop then assigned him with the other five the next day following, which was the 9th of February, to appear before him again, to give a resolute answer what they would stick unto. Which day being come, and these foresaid six prisoners being severally called before the bishop, at the coming of Thomas Haukes, the bishop willed him to remember what was said to him yesterday, and now, while he had time and space, to advise with himself what he would answer, for he stood upon life and death. 'Well,' quoth master Haukes again, 'I will willingly receive whatsoever shall be put upon me.' Then were certain other interrogatories or articles commenced against him by the said bishop (in like manner as to the other) to the number of four, with another bill also, which Bonner brought out of his bosom, containing private matters against the said Thomas Haukes, which the bishop called heresies and errors, but we may better call them Christian verities.

To the which matter being read, the said Haukes answered openly again, saying that it was true, and that he was glad it was so true as it was; with more words to the like effect. And this was in the forenoon, the 9th day of February.

"In the afternoon again the said Haukes appearing and hearing the foresaid bill of his confession, with the articles and interrogatories read unto him, with like constancy in answering again to the bishop, 'My lord,' said he, 'as you, being my great friend[6], have caused these my sayings to be written; so do you cause them to be read: and yet I will never go from them.' And then, being exhorted by the bishop, with many fair words, to return again to the bosom of the mother church: 'No, my lord,' said he, 'that will I not: for if I had a hundred bodies, I would suffer them all to be torn in pieces, rather than I will abjure or recant.' And so continuing still in the same song, notwithstanding that the doctors and lawyers were ever calling upon him to come again to the unity of the church, he ever kept them off with this answer, that he would never go from the belief he was in, so long as he believed[7]. Whereupon Bonner, at the last, read the sentence of death upon him; and so was he condemned the same day with the residue of his fellows, which was the 9th of February. Nevertheless his execution was prolonged, and he remained in prison till the 10th day of June."—*Fox*, vol. vii. p. 113.

(21.) THOMAS WATS.—His case is just one of those which would illustrate many of the points on which I have insisted, but to give it in detail would only be tiresome. Briefly, he was a linen-draper "of Billericay within the county of Essex of the diocese of London[8]." On the 26th of April, 1555, he was "brought before Lord Riche and other commissioners at Chelmsford." At his examination he "took occasion to speak somewhat of King Philip and of his coming in; but what it was," says the anonymous reporter, "I could not justly learn." These interruptions at such turns in stories like this, are very disappointing, and make us look rather to those narratives which were written by the parties themselves, most of whom would make a great point of setting down those parts of their testimony which their more prudent friends who were present would not be particularly careful to hear, or anxious to record. However "thus much was heard; that after 'those words spoken the bench among themselves stood up, 'and said one to another 'Treason,' saving one good man 'called justice Gaudy, who a little before was about to

[6] "My friend." Both ed.
[7] "Lived." Both ed.
[8] Fox, vii. 118.

'speak: but when he heard them cry treason he held down 'his head as one grieved and troubled at their doings." Fox gives the letter signed by the eight Essex justices[9] with which Wats was sent up to Bonner. In the course of it they say "in our opinion he is one of the most arrogant 'heretics that hath been heard to speak, or ever came before 'you, and not meet to be kept here in any gaol as well for 'fear of corrupting others, as for *divers and sundry other* '*special causes hereafter to be declared.*" These special causes are not, however, stated by Fox; who, immediately after the letter, goes on to say, "Now when the bishop had received him, how he used him it is easy (by his common practices with others) to judge. What his private conferences were *I know not.*" It seems probable that in many cases the martyrologist was not furnished with all the particulars respecting those whose story he was to relate; "but," he adds, "what was publicly done in the consistory at Pauls (the common stage for these tragedies) you shall here see," &c. But it is needless for us to go through the details—how on Thursday the second of May he was brought up and the bishop "after *many persuasions* to recant" ordered him to return the next day—how in the bishop's absence Dr. Harpsfield his deputy did sit "and *earnestly exhorted* him to deny his opinions"—and how on Friday the 10th of May the bishop "privately sent the said Thomas 'Wats into his chamber, and there, with *many fair promises* 'tempted and tried him whether he would revoke his errors 'as he termed them"—and how he was dismissed for another week, and then "the bishop perceiving his fair flattering promises nothing to avail, and having no great store of other reasons to persuade with, put forth his last and strongest argument of condemnation." What else Bonner could have done, it would be hard to say. The sentence seems to have been passed on Saturday the 18th of May, and executed at Chelmsford on the 10th of June. It is right to add, that notwithstanding the tone and manner in which Fox relates the story, the man himself is not represented as having used any offensive expression, or said anything indicative of hostility, either to, or in respect of,

[9] Lord Riche, Henry Tyrrel, Anthony Brown, Edmund Tyrrel, Thomas Mildmay, John Wiseman, Roger Appleton, Richard Weston.

Bonner; while at the stake he as bitterly charged his death upon Lord Riche, as Robert Hunter did that of his brother on his lordship's colleague Justice Brown.

(22, 23, 24.) THOMAS OSMOND, and five others from Coggeshall are next mentioned. They were sent up by Lord Oxford and Sir Philip Paris Knight, with a letter dated May 1st, 1555. There are very few particulars respecting them except that three of them abjured; and the three others having been "examined and travailed with by *fair and flattering speeches, as well of the bishop* as of others *his assistants*" in vain, were sent down to Essex for execution, and suffered on the 14th and 15th of June.

(25.) JOHN BRADFORD.—He has been already mentioned at p. 354. I do not see any reason assigned for the delay of his execution which led Fox to postpone the account of him[1].

(26.) JOHN LEAF, aged 19, apprentice to a tallow chandler of the parish of Christchurch in London, suffered with Bradford. He was committed (I do not see why) "to the Compter in Bread Street by an alderman of London, who had rule and charge of that Ward, or part of the city, where the said Leaf did dwell," on Friday the 5th of April. How often he was brought before Bonner in the mean time does not appear, but he was ordered to appear for sentence on the 10th of June; and then the bishop "essaying by *all* 'manner of ways to revoke him to his own trade, that is, from 'truth to error, notwithstanding all his *persuasions*, *threats*, 'and *promises* found him the same man still, so planted 'upon the sure rock of truth, that no words nor deeds of 'men could remove him." Still the bishop returned to the attack, but "being too weak either to refute his sentence or 'to remove his constancy, proceeded consequently to read 'the popish sentence of cruel condemnation." What else could he do with a prisoner who, before this, when his confession and a form of recantation were sent to him in gaol, that he might set his mark to one or the other, sent back the former sprinkled with his own blood?

(33.) DIRICK CARVER and (34.) JOHN LAUNDER. This is a case which must not be quite passed over on more than one account. Bishop Burnet says "Dirick Carver was burnt

[1] Fox, vii. 143.

'at Lewes; and on the 23rd John Launder was burnt at 'Stening. They had been taken in London, and brought 'before Bonner; *but he would not meddle with them*, and 'desired they might be sent to their *own ordinaries*." This testimony is important though I do not see on what authority it is given. All that I observe in Fox amounts to this —that Dirick Carver, a foreigner by birth[2], but a wealthy brewer at Brighton, had private meetings at his house for the performance of divine service according to King Edward's book—that at one of those meetings, about the end of October 1554, twelve persons (of whom Carver himself was one, and John Launder, and Thomas Iveson or Everson, were two others) were apprehended by Sir Edward Gage. He sent them up to the Council in London, who committed them to Newgate on the 1st of November.

This of course brought them into Bonner's jurisdiction, for they certainly dwelt in his diocese and if they were heretics at all had brought their heresies with them; and I notice the case because it is one of those which have given ground, and may seem to give some colour, to Heylin's language, "let them be sent for up by order from the Lords of

[2] In his confession, as given by Fox, he states, that he had lived at Brighton "by the space of eight or nine years," having been "born in the village of Dilson, by Stockom in the land of Luke." On this Mr. Cattley puts a note, "'In the parish of Lynch, in the hundred of Eastbourne, 'there was an ancient chapel dedicated to St. Luke, and so called in Speed's 'map of the county. . . . The whole parish may be estimated at 1084 'acres. Of these, 700 lie compactly and are called Lynch-farm, at the 'base of the great range of down near the parishes of Didling, Stedham, 'and Bepton.' See Daleaway's West Division of Sussex, vol. i. p. 299. 'How far 'Stockom' might be identified with 'Scopham' (the ancient 'name of Shoreham), must remain uncertain.—Ed." It may remain uncertain to the editor, who seems to have taken it for granted that a man of forty, who leads one to suppose that he had lived in Brighton only eight or nine years, must have been born in some part of Sussex. But I apprehend, that all doubt will be removed from the mind of any reader who turns to M. Oudiette's "Dictionnaire Géographique et Topographique des treize Departemens," &c. where he will find "Dilsem, village, départ. de la Meuse-Inférieure, arrond. de Ruremonde, ci-dev. pays de Liège, Popul. env. 600 habitans, *près de* Stockem." vol. i. p. 78. This "pays de Liège" the man himself probably called, as the Dutch I believe now do, the land of "*Luyk*." The place of his birth was probably mentioned to meet the question of his being a British subject; and therefore even if he was commonly known by the name of a place where he had carried on business, and whence he had come, it would be no less necessary to say precisely where he was born.

'the Council, committed to the Tower, the Fleet, or any 'other prison within my diocese; and when I have them in 'my clutches let God do so, and more to Bonner, if they 'scape his fingers." It may be observed that these six prisoners do not seem to have been sent for by the Council, but rather unwelcomely thrust upon it by the zeal of a Sussex magistrate; nor do I recollect any case (though such may be recorded) that would justify Heylin's statement. As to Bonner, however, the confiding reader will naturally suppose that he had immediate, if not instinctive, notice of their setting foot within his jurisdiction, and instantly sprang on his prey; but, in fact, he seems to have taken no notice, if he even knew, of the transaction for eight months; when he received a letter from the Marquis of Winchester, Lord Treasurer (dated the 7th of June) in which his lordship, having discussed some matters relating to the obsequies of the King's grandmother, in a way which looks rather as if he wished to put the bishop in good humour, before he came to business which would be to say the least troublesome, and having then had occasion to speak of the martyrdom of Bradford, added, "There be divers like prisoners 'that came from Sussex, that be not yet examined before 'you, lying now in Newgate, *which must be examined by you* '*since they be come to London;* and so I pray they may be, 'and I certified of your proceedings, that I may follow; 'which I shall do" &c. In the course of a few days they were examined.

But this matter also deserves attention as furnishing an example of that which must have forced itself on the notice of all those who have had any experience in detecting and tracing out error—namely, how the pen of straightforward truth seems to have been so guided, even in what may appear trifling matters of phraseology, as exactly to meet such falsifications, as he who used it could never have anticipated. The articles ministered to these men, who were considered, and dealt with, as inhabitants of the diocese of London, present some differences from those ministered to most of the prisoners which are worthy of notice, as will be seen by the following extracts:—

"First, I do object against you, and every of you, that ye and every of you, *being within the said prison of Newgate and within the said city of London,* are *of my jurisdiction* (being bishop of London),

and subject unto the same, *offending and trespassing within the said prison and city in matters of religion*, and concerning the catholic faith and belief of the church in any wise.

"2. Item, I do object against you, and every of you, that ye and every of you, since your first coming and entering into the said prison, and during your abode there, *both there and in sundry places within this city and diocese of London*, have holden, maintained, and defended sundry opinions against the sacraments of the church, especially against the sacrament of penance and also against the sacrament of the altar."—*Fox*, vii. 324.

* * * * *

"12. Item, I do likewise object and say, that I the said bishop of London was commanded, by the authority of the said council, to make process against you, and every of you, so that it was not my procuring or searching that ye should be commanded or called before me in this matter of heresy, but partly your own demerits, and partly the said commandment, enforced me to call and send for you to make answer herein; and hereof to show you the said letters."—*Ibid.* 325.

Fox proceeds:—

"Upon Monday, being the said tenth day of June, these two persons, with others, were brought by the keeper unto the bishop's consistory (as it was before commanded) at one of the clock in the afternoon; where the bishop, first beginning with the said Dirick Carver, caused his confession with the articles and answers to be openly read unto him (which order he kept at the condemnation of every prisoner), asking him whether he would stand to the same. To whom the said Dirick answered, that he would: 'for your doctrine,' quoth he, 'is poison and sorcery. If Christ were here you would put him to a worse death than he was put to before. You say, that you can make a god: ye can make a pudding as well. Your ceremonies in the church be beggary and poison. And further I say, that auricular confession is contrary to God's word, and very poison:' with divers other such words[3].

---

[3] The following passage in the work of Miles Hoggard already mentioned at p. 234, seems to refer to Dirick Carver, and his companions, and to attest his foreign extraction:—

"Also about xii monethes past, before the Reverende father the bishop of London, there were arraigned in the consistorie of Paules for their 'opinions against the Sacrament of the Altar, iiii Sussex men, the one of 'them was a ducheman, and dwelled besides Lewes, who being demaunded 'among others, what baptism was, the one answered it was a sacrament. 'Then he was demanded whether a man might be a christian without it, ''Yea doubtles q̄d he; for it is but an externe signe and worketh little 'grace. For' said he 'like as a man doth wash his hands in a bason of 'water signifying that the hands are clean ever, so the child is washed at 'Baptism to accomplish the exterior figure.' Then was objected unto him 'the saying of Christe 'Unles a man be borne agayne with water and the

"The bishop, seeing his constancy, and that neither his accustomed flatteries, nor yet his cruel threatenings could once move this good man to incline to their idolatry, pronounced his usual and general blessing, as well towards this Dirick as also upon the said John Launder, although severally: who (after the like manner of process used with him) remained in the same constancy, as did the other, and therefore were both delivered unto the sheriffs, who were there present," &c.—*Ibid.*

Carver suffered on the 22nd July, Launder the day after, and Iveson or Everson about the same month. The other nine, I presume, were reconciled.

(37.) JOHN DENLEY, (38.) JOHN NEWMAN, and (39.) PATRICK PACKINGHAM. Their cases seem not to present any peculiar features; and may be passed over for the sake of brevity. The next are those of *ten* prisoners, all if I mistake not of the bishop's own diocese, but sent to him by the commissioners[4].

The narratives relating to these would furnish much ground for remark; but there is only one which has the peculiar interest and value that belongs to autobiography; and certainly it is so characteristic, and so much to the purpose, that it cannot be passed over; though only a small part can be extracted. Moreover it is the history of one connected with a person of whom we have already heard; who, while he contrived to keep himself out of harm in these troubles, and was the admiration of both Gardiner and Bonner, appears to have wanted either the will or the power to save the life of an old servant of his own. As to Sir Thomas Smith himself, Strype says, "though he thus escaped this man," [that is Bonner] "yet another of his name, who was also a retainer to him at Eton when Provost there, *fell* into his hands, whom he left not till he had reduced him into ashes; namely,

(49.) ROBERT SMITH, who was burnt at Uxbridge in the year 1555[5]." Fox introduces the story in the following manner;—

"Robert Smith was brought unto Newgate the 5th of November,

'holy ghoste he could not be saved.' 'Tushe,' saith he, 'the water pro-
'fiteth nothing, it is the Holy Ghost that worketh' who, with the rest,
'most worthily were condempned and burned in Sussex."—f. 11. *b.*

[4] With a letter given at length in Fox, signed by Nicholas Hare, William Roper, Richard Rede, and William Cooke.

[5] Life of Sir Thomas Smith, p. 51.

in the first and second year of the king and queen, by John Matthew, yeoman of the guard, of the queen's side, by the commandment of the council. This Smith first gave himself unto service in the house of sir Thomas Smith, knight, being then provost of Eton: from thence he was preferred to Windsor, having there in the college a clerkship of ten pound a year. Of stature he was tall and slender, active about many things, but chiefly delighting in the art of painting, which, many times, rather for his mind's sake than for any living or lucre, he did practise and exercise. In religion he was fervent, after he had once tasted the truth; wherein he was much confirmed by the preachings and readings of one master Turner of Windsor and others. Whereupon at the coming of Queen Mary he was deprived of his clerkship by her visitors, and not long after he was apprehended, and brought to examination before Bonner, as here followeth, written and testified with his own hand."—*Fox*, vii. 347.

It is just one of those puzzles which one constantly finds in trying to understand stories told by those who do not mean to tell all. Having been informed, as a mere matter of fact, without any hint of why or wherefore, that Robert Smith was brought to Newgate on the 5th of November 1554, the reader is unconsciously carried over a period of eight months, and finds the prisoner at his first examination by Bonner on the 5th of July 1555. Not a word of anything that had happened between. One cannot but imagine, that the original charge against a prisoner thus committed to Newgate by the Council, through the agency of a Yeoman of the Guard, was not mere heresy, but something of either a criminal, or a political nature. Perhaps even the slight and scattered notices which we have of the time may throw some light upon the matter. We are told that on the evening preceding Robert Smith's commitment, a great fray "began" at Charing Cross between the Spaniards and the English, on account of which certain persons were taken the next day. Of this fray I find no fuller account than that which I give below[6]. Though the time of its beginning is thus specified, I do not discover anything more of its continuance, end, or consequences. Nor does it appear what became of those who were "taken," unless they were the

[6] "The iiij day of November be-gane a grett fray at Charyng crosse at viij of the cloke at nyght be-twyn the Spaneardes and Englysmen, the wyche thrugh wysdom ther wher but a fuwe hort, and after the next day thay wher serten taken that be-gane yt; on was a blake-mor, and was brought a-for the hed offesers by the knyght-marshall['s] servandes."—*Machyn*, p. 74.

persons who were hanged on that spot on the 26th of April following[7], for robbing of certain Spaniards. If it be thought strange that the punishment of the prisoners taken in November should have been so long delayed, I can only say that I do not see anything that looks like a trial or execution for the offence in the mean while; and, further, that however strange it may seem, it is quite clear that Robert Smith, whatever might be his offence, was in prison during all that time, and a good deal longer; and that we have no account of his being examined at all before July.

It may be worth while to observe, that one of the three men hanged at Charing Cross for robbing the Spaniards was John Tooley; who has been immortalized by Fox for his testimony against the Pope, delivered at his execution. He seems to have been a poulterer, and to have been for some time a notorious character; for among the depositions which were taken after his execution, respecting his conduct at that time, we have one from Philip Andrew, under Marshal of the Marshalsea, of the age of 54 years, who tells us that, on being informed of what the prisoner was saying, he went "and rebuked him" calling him "*seditious* traitor;" and telling him that he had been "worthy to be hanged seven years ago."[8] That these were not mere words of abuse, may be thought probable from the circumstance that he appears to have received the king's pardon for some offence sufficient to work a forfeiture of his lands and goods in the preceding reign[9]. He seems to have been allowed to hang at Charing Cross from the Friday on which he was executed, until the following Monday; when he was cut down and buried under the gallows. By whose authority this was done, I do not see; but it appears that on the intervening Sunday a letter was addressed to Bonner, signed by the Lord Chancellor, and six other members of the Council, informing him that they had heard of Tooley's heretical proceedings, and praying him "to cause further 'inquiry to be made thereof, and thereupon to proceed to 'the making out of such process as by the ecclesiastical laws

[7] "The xxvj day of Aprell was cared from the Marselsee in a care thrugh London unto Charyng-crosse to the galows, and ther hangyd, iij men for robyng of serten Spaneardes of tresur of gold owt of the abbay of Vestmynster."—*Ibid.* 86.

[8] Fox, vii. 95.

[9] Strype, Mem. vol. II. pt. ii. p. 239.

'is provided in that behalf." Accordingly on the Tuesday, Bishop Bonner issued "a writ or mandate" which he caused to be "set up at Charing Cross, on Paules church door, and at St. Martin in the Field, for the citing and further enquiring out of the case of John Tooley." In consequence of this process the body of John Tooley was delivered to the sheriffs of London and burned[1].

I mention these circumstances because Robert Smith says in one of his letters to his wife, written during his imprisonment, "I have not yet (tell my brother) spoken with the 'person. There hath come so strait a commandment, that 'no man might come to us, because Tooley cursed the Pope 'at the gallows. *They thought it to be our counsel*[2]."

But whether Robert Smith had, or had not, anything to do with the Spanish fray, and whatever might be the cause of his imprisonment, it seems that it had continued eight months when he was brought before the Bishop of London for examination, on the charge of heresy; an offence which he had had ample time and peculiar opportunity to commit

[1] Fox makes great fun of "the ridiculous handling and proceeding of Bishop Bonner and his Mates against John Tooley," in which he is followed by Bishop Burnet, and other writers, who are facetious on the subject of his citing a dead man to appear in his court, and tell us that the dead man did not mind him, &c. Where they found any evidence of his having done so, I know not. Certainly there is nothing that looks like it in the long mandate given by Fox, which is addressed to the bishop's "sworn sumnor," specially and particularly directing what parties he was to cite. Whether or no, it can scarcely be doubted that the usual practice of the court was followed; and even Fox acquits Bonner of having done any thing in the business until he received this order from the government.

[2] I may add to this, that part of Tooley's conduct at his execution which gave offence was, that he read a prayer from a printed book, and other prayers which were written on paper. With regard to "the said book of prayers," it is stated by one of the deponents, that the said Tooley delivered it to one of the Marshal's officers "and willed him to deliver it to one *Haukes* saying that it was his book." There seems to be no doubt that this Haukes is the person with whom we have already been made acquainted, who was then a fellow prisoner of Robert Smith; and one cannot but suspect that the written prayer which was inscribed, "Beware of Antichrist" at the top, and "Per me *Thomam Harold*, prisoner in the Marshalsea, enemy to Antichrist," at the bottom, might have some sort of connexion with the *Harold Tomson* who was (as we have seen) before the Commissioners, and vanished without any notice of discharge or execution. Except on this occasion I do not find that Thomas Harold is mentioned by Fox.

during his confinement in the diocese of that prelate. "As 'thou seest him here," says Fox, "boldly standing examina-'tion before the Bishop and Doctors, so he was no less com-'fortable also in the prison among his fellows; which also is 'to be observed no less in his other prison fellows, who, 'being there together cast in an outward house within New-'gate had godly conference within themselves with daily 'praying and public reading, which they, to their great com-'fort, used in that house together; amongst whom this 'foresaid Smith was a chief doer: whose industry was always 'solicitous not only for them of his own company, but also 'his diligence was careful for other prisoners whom he ceased 'not to dehort and dissuade from their old accustomed ini-'quity, and many he converted unto his religion[3]." Our business is however rather with what passed in his examinations, where, says Mr. Strype, "he spake readily and to the 'purpose and *gave that Prelate his own*." The meaning of this will be in some degree apparent by the beginning of his first examination, which was as follows:—

"About nine o'clock in the morning, I was among the rest of my brethren brought to the bishop's house; and I, first of all, was brought before him into his chamber, to whom the bishop said as followeth, after he had asked my name.

"*Bonner.* 'How long is it ago since the time that ye were confessed to any priest?'

"*Smith.* 'Never since I had years of discretion. For I never saw it needful, neither commanded of God to come to show my faults to any of that sinful number, whom ye call priests.'

[3] VII. 356. This may show that the considering a prisoner in Newgate as a person guilty of heresy in the diocese of London was not a mere legal fiction; and the same is apparent from the case of William Andrew, one of the ten thus sent to Bonner, but whose case does not come within the limits of our enquiry, as he died in prison. "The first and principal 'promoter of him," says Fox, "was the Lord Riche, who sent him first to 'prison. Another great doer against him also seemeth to be Sir Richard 'Southwell Knight, by a letter written by him to Bonner, as by the copy 'hereof appeareth." The Letter begins "Pleaseth it your Lordship to 'understand, that the Lord Riche did, about seven or eight weeks past, 'send up unto the Council one William Andrew of Thorp, within the 'county of Essex, an arrogant heretic. Their pleasure was to command 'me to commit him unto Newgate, where he remaineth, and, as I am 'informed, hath infected a number in the prison with his heresy. Your 'Lordship shall do very well, if it please you to convent him before you, 'and to take order with him as his case doth require. I know the Council 'meant to have writ herein unto your Lordship, but, by occasion of other 'business, the thing hath been omitted," &c.—*Fox*, vii. 371.

"*Bonner.* 'Thou showest thyself, even at the first chop, to be a rank heretic, which, being weary of painting, art entered into divinity, and so fallen, through thy departing from thy vocation, into heresy.'

"*Smith.* 'Although I have understanding in the said occupation, yet, I praise God, I have had little need all my life hitherto to live by the same, but have lived without the same in mine own house as honestly in my vocation, as ye have lived in yours, and yet used the same better *than ever you used the pulpit.*'

"*Bonner.* 'How long is it ago since ye received the sacrament of the altar, and what is your opinion in the same?'

"*Smith.* 'I never received the same since I had years of discretion, nor ever will, by God's grace; neither do esteem the same in any point, because it hath not God's ordinance, neither in name, nor in usage, but rather is set up and erected to mock God withal.'" —*Fox*, vii. 347.

In the course of this day's examination he tells us;—

"We were carried unto my lord's hall, where we were baited of my lord's band, almost all the day, until our keeper, seeing their misorder, shut us up all in a fair chamber, while my lord went into his synagogue to condemn master Denly and John Newman. Then brought they up my Lord Mayor to hear our matter above in the chamber, and I, first of all, was called into the chamber, where my lord intended to sup; where my Lord Mayor, being set with the Bishop and one of the Sheriffs, wine was walking on every side: I, standing before them as an outcast. Which made me remember how Pilate and Herod were made friends, but no man was sorry for Joseph's hurt. But, after my lord had well drunk, my articles were sent for and read, and he demanded whether I said not, as was written?

"*Smith.* 'That I have said, I have said; and what I have said, I do mean utterly.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, my lord mayor, your lordsdip hath heard somewhat, what a stout heretic this is, and that his articles have deserved death: yet nevertheless, forsomuch as they report me to seek blood, and call me 'Bloody Bonner,' whereas God knoweth, I never sought any man's blood in all my life, I have stayed him from the Consistory this day, whither I might have brought him justly; and yet here, before your lordship, I desire him to turn, and I will with all speed dispatch him out of trouble; and this I profess before your lordship and all this audience.'

"*Smith.* 'Why, my lord, do ye put on this fair visor before my lord mayor, to make him believe that ye seek not my blood, to cloak your murders through my stoutness, as ye call it? Have ye not had my brother Tomkins before you, whose hand when you had burned most cruelly, ye burnt also his body? And not only of him, but of a great many of the members of Christ, men that feared God, and lived virtuously, and also the queen's majesty's most true subjects, as their goods and bodies have made manifest? And seeing in these saints ye have showed so little mercy, shall it seem

to my lord and this audience, that ye show me more favour? No, no, my lord. But if ye mean as ye say, why then examine ye me of that I am not bound to answer you unto?'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, what sayest thou by the sacrament of the altar? Is it not the very body of Christ, flesh, blood, and bone, as it was born of the Virgin?'

"*Smith.* 'I have answered, that it is none of God's order, neither any sacrament, but man's own vain invention;' and showed him the Lord's institution.

"But when he was so earnest before the audience, declaring that we knew nothing, bringing out his 'hoc est corpus meum,' to lay in my dish, I proved before the audience, that it was a dead god, declaring the distinction appointed between the two creatures of bread and wine, and that a body without blood hath no life; at which Harpsfield found himself much offended, and took the tale out of my lord's mouth, saying, 'I will approve by the Scriptures, that ye blaspheme God in so saying,'" &c.—*Ibid.* 349.

The account of the second examination, which took place on the following day, begins thus;—

"Upon Saturday at eight of the clock, I was brought to his chamber again, and there by him examined, as followeth:—

"*Bonner.* 'Thou, Robert Smith, etc. sayest that there is no catholic church here on earth.'

"*Smith.* 'Ye have heard me both speak the contrary, and ye have written as a witness of the same.'

"*Bonner.* 'Yea, but I must ask thee this question: how sayest thou?'

"*Smith.* 'Must ye of necessity *begin with a* LIE? it maketh manifest that ye determine to end with the same: but there shall no LIARS enter into the kingdom of God. Nevertheless, if ye will be answered, ask mine articles that were written yesterday, and they shall tell you that I have confessed a church of God, as well in earth as in heaven; and yet all one church, and one man's members, even Christ Jesus.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, what sayest thou to auricular confession? Is it not necessary to be used in Christ's church, and wilt thou not be shriven of the priest?'

"*Smith.* 'It is not needful to be used in Christ's church, as I answered yesterday: but if it be needful for your church, it is to pick men's purses. And such pick-purse matters is all the whole rabble of your ceremonies; for all is but money matters that ye maintain.'

"*Bonner.* 'Why, how art thou able to prove that confession is a pick-purse matter? Art thou not ashamed so to say?'

"*Smith.* 'I speak by experience; for I have both heard and seen the fruits of the same. For, first, it hath been, we see, a bewrayer of king's secrets, and the secrets of other men's consciences; who, being delivered, and glad to be discharged of their sins, have given to priests great sums of money to absolve them, and sing masses for their soul's health.'

"And for ensample, I began to bring in a pageant, that by report was played at St. Thomas of Acres, and where I was sometime a child waiting on a gentleman of Norfolk, who being bound in conscience, through the persuasion of the priest, gave away a great sum of his goods, and forgave unto master Gresham a great sum of money, and to another as much. The priest had for his part a sum, and the house had an annuity to keep him; the which thing when his brother heard, he came down to London, and after declaration made to the council, how, by the subtlety of the priest he had robbed his wife and children, recovered a great part again, to the value of two or three hundred pounds, of master Gresham and his other friend; but what he gave to the house, could not be recovered. This tale began I to tell. But when my lord saw it savoured not to his purpose, he began to revile me, and said, 'By the mass, if the queen's majesty were of his mind, I should not come to talk before any man, but should be put into a sack, and a dog tied unto the same, and so should be thrown into the water.'

"To which I answered again, saying, 'I know you speak by practice, as much as by speculation: for both you and your predecessors have sought all means possible to kill Christ secretly; record of master Hun, whom your predecessor caused to be thrust in at the nose with hot burning needles, and then to be hanged, and said the same Hun to have hanged himself: and also a good brother of yours, a bishop of your profession, having in his prison an innocent man, whom because he saw he was not able by the Scriptures to overcome, he made him privily to be snarled, and his flesh to be torn and plucked away with a pair of pincers, and, bringing him before the people, said the rats had eaten him. Thus, according to your oath is all your dealing, and hath been; and as you, taking upon you the office, do not without oaths open your mouth, no more do you without murder maintain your traditions.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ah! ye are a generation of liars; there is not a true word that cometh out of your mouths.'

"*Smith.* 'Yes, my lord, I have said that Jesus Christ is dead for my sins, and risen for my justification; and this is no lie.'"—*Ibid.* 350.

It does not appear at this examination how many persons were present. But it is clear that Sir John Mordant was there, for on a very strong statement of Smith's respecting baptism the Bishop exclaimed;—

"*Bonner.* 'By the mass this is the most unshamefaced heretic that ever I heard speak.'

"*Smith.* 'Well sworn, my lord; ye keep a good watch.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, master comptroller, ye catch me at my words: but I will watch thee as well, I warrant thee.'

"'By my troth, my lord,' quoth master Mordant, 'I never heard the like in all my life.'"—*Fox*, vii. 351.

The argument went on however without much interrup-

tion or variation of style, until the bishop thinking enough had been said repecting the sacrament of baptism went on,

"*Bonner.* 'Well, Sir, what say you to the sacrament of orders?'

"*Smith.* 'Ye may call it the sacrament of misorders; for all orders are appointed of God. But as for your shaving, anointing, greasing, polling, and rounding, there are no such things appointed in God's book, and therefore I have nothing to do to believe your orders. And as for you, my lord, if ye had grace and intelligence, ye would not so disfigure yourself as ye do.'

"*Bonner.* 'Sayest thou so? Now, by my troth, I will go shave myself, to anger thee withal:' and so sent for his barber, who immediately came. And *before my face* at the door of the next chamber he shaved himself, desiring me before he went to answer to these articles.

* * * * *

"With this came my lord from shaving, and asked me how I liked him?

"*Smith.* 'Forsooth, ye are even as wise as ye were before ye were shaven.'

"*Bonner.* 'How standeth it, master doctors, have ye done any good?'

"*Doctor.* 'No, by my troth, my lord, we can do no good.'

"*Smith.* 'Then it is fulfilled which is written, How can an evil tree bring forth good fruit?'

"*Bonner.* 'Nay, naughty fellow; I set these gentlemen to bring thee home to Christ.'

"*Smith.* 'Such gentlemen, such Christs; and as truly as they have that name from Christ, so truly do they teach Christ.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, wilt thou neither hear them, nor me?'

"*Smith.* 'Yes, I am compelled to hear you; but ye cannot compel me to follow you.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, thou shalt be burnt at a stake in Smithfield, if thou wilt not turn.'

"*Smith.* 'And ye shall burn in hell, if ye repent not. But, my lord, to put you out of doubt, because I am weary, I will strain courtesy with you: I perceive you will not, with your doctors, come unto me, and I am determined not to come unto you, by God's grace; for I have hardened my face against you as hard as brass.'

"Then, after many railing sentences, I was sent away. And thus have I left the truth of mine answers in writing, gentle reader, being compelled by my friends to do it; that ye may see how the Lord hath, according to his promise, given me a mouth and wisdom to answer in his cause, for which I am condemned, and my cause not heard."—*Ibid.* 353.

Whether the reader will form as high an opinion of Robert Smith's wisdom as he did himself, I do not take upon me to decide. Then follows "The last examination of Robert Smith, with his condemnation in the Consistory," which begins thus;—

"The 12th of July I was with my brethren brought into the consistory, and mine articles read before my lord mayor and the sheriffs, with all the assistants; to which I answered, as followeth:

"*Bonner.* 'By my faith, my lord mayor, I have showed him as much favour as any man living might do: but I perceive all is lost, both in him and all his company.'

"At this word, which he coupled with an oath, came I in, and taking him with the manner said, 'My lord, it is written, ye must not swear.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ah, master comptroller, are ye come? Lo, my lord mayor, this is master speaker,' pointing to my brother Tankerfield, 'and this is master comptroller,' pointing to me.

"And then, beginning to read my articles."—*Fox*, vii. 354.

Then after some intermediate matter, the chief purport of which is to show that Master Mordant told a lie, he proceeds—

"Then proceeded my lord, with the rest of mine articles, demanding of me, if I said not as was written. To which I answered: 'No,' and turning to my lord mayor, I said, I require you my lord mayor, in God's behalf, unto whom pertaineth your sword and justice, that I may here, before your presence, answer to these objections that are laid against me, and have the probation of the same; and if any thing that I have said or will say, be to be proved (as my lord saith) heresy, I shall not only with all my heart forsake the same, and cleave to the truth, but also recant whereso-ever ye shall assign me, and all this audience shall be witness to the same.'

"*Mayor.* 'Why, Smith, thou canst not deny, but this thou saidst.'

"*Smith.* 'Yes, my lord, I deny that which he hath written, because he hath both added to, and diminished from, the same: but what I have spoken, I will never deny.'

"*Mayor.* 'Why, thou spakest against the blessed sacrament of the altar.'

"*Smith.* 'I denied it to be any sacrament, and I do stand here to make probation of the same; and if my lord here, or any of his doctors, be able to approve either the name or usage of the same, I will recant mine error.'

"Then spake my brother Tankerfield, and defended the proba-tion of those things, which they called heresy: to which the bishop answered, 'By my troth, master speaker, ye shall preach at a stake.'

"*Smith.* 'Well sworn, my lord, ye keep a good watch."

"*Bonner.* 'Well, master comptroller, I am no saint.'

"*Smith.* 'No, my lord, nor yet good bishop; for a bishop, saith St. Paul, should be faultless, and a dedicate vessel unto God. And are ye not ashamed to sit in judgment, and be a blasphemer, con-demning innocents.'

"*Bonner.* 'Well, master comptroller, ye are faultless.'

"*Smith.* 'My lord mayor, I require you, in God's name, that I may have justice.'—*Fox*, vii. 354.

This his last examination was, as has been already stated, on the 12th of July; and he was burned on the 8th of August.

(75.) JOHN PHILPOT. After what has been said, his case need not detain us; for nobody I suppose will make his martyrdom the ground of particular charge against Bonner. If it be done, the discussion will require much more space than can be allowed for it in a cursory view like the present.

(76.) THOMAS WHITTLE. Here the martyr is his own historian; but the case is so singular, that one cannot but wish that he had been rather more explicit in some points. However, as it is one of the stories of Bonner's wanton and unaccountable cruelty, I must not pass it by; and really, if I were writing with more of the spirit of an apologist than I do, I should not feel anxious to remove the impression which the facts, even as we receive them, are calculated to make on any considerate reader. Fox introduces the matter thus;—

"In the story of master Philpot, mention was made before, of a married priest, whom he found in the coal-house at his first coming thither, in heaviness of mind and great sorrow, for recanting the doctrine which he had taught in king Edward's days, whose name was Thomas Whittle of Essex; and thus lieth his story. This Thomas Whittle, after he had been expulsed from the place in Essex[4] where he served, went abroad where he might, now here and there as occasion was ministered, preaching and sowing the gospel of Christ. At length being apprehended by one Edmund Alablaster, in hope of reward and promotion, which he miserably gaped after, he was brought first as a prisoner before the bishop of Winchester, who then was fallen lately sick of his disease, whereof not long after he died most strangely. But the apprehender for his proffered service was highly checked and rated of the bishop, asking if there were no man unto whom he might bring such rascals, but to him: 'Hence,' quoth he, 'out of my sight, thou varlet! what dost thou trouble me with such matters?' The greedy cormorant being thus defeated of his desired prey, yet thinking to seek and to hunt further, carried his prisoner to the bishop of London, with whom what an evil mess of handling this Whittle had, and how he was by the bishop all-to beaten and buffeted about the face, by this his own

[4] The place was Kirby-in-le-Soken, of which he had become Rector during the preceding reign (18 April, 1550). His being found in the Coal House by Philpot was on the 24th of October, 1555. According to Newcourt he had been deprived in 1554. The date which he assigns to William Parnell, the Successor in the living, is Feb. 1, 1554.

narration in a letter sent unto his friend, manifestly may appear."—*Fox*, vii. 718.

This is all very well; but we feel conscious that the prudent narrator is not telling us the whole story, or even telling what he does tell, fairly. We might perhaps be satisfied to believe that one Alablaster, gaping for promotion, accidentally lighted on a heretic; and, thinking it a good opportunity to make his fortune, carried him to Bishop Gardiner; and, being disappointed of a market there, went on with his prize to the next-best customer, being pretty sure that if he went the round of the blood-thirsty bishops, he should find some one who would buy his bargain, and reward him—we might, I say, take all this as a matter of course, if we had not just read in the articles ministered to the seven martyrs of whom Thomas Whittle was one, "Item, that thou the said N. being convented 'before certain Judges or Commissioners . . . . . wast by 'their commandment sent unto me and my prison, to be 'examined by me, and process to be made against thee for 'thy offence herein;" with the assent of the prisoners thereto, "Thomas Whittle adding, and affirming, that the Lord Chancellor that then was, sent him up to the bishop there present." This gives rather a different view of the matter, especially as so very little is said of the previous condition of Thomas Whittle, why he was "expulsed from the place in Essex where he served," or what he had been doing in particular when he was apprehended by one Edmund Alablaster, of whom we should probably have heard somewhere else if he had been a person possessing plenary powers to apprehend anybody who came in his way, without any alledged reason. It seems that Thomas Whittle, priest, was not merely a person accidentally picked up by one Alablaster; but one whom the Chancellor, for some reason or other, thought fit to send to the Bishop of London. It is however one of the blind stories which we must take as we find it; and, without much knowledge of the man, we must be glad to let him tell his own tale in his own way, and learn what we can from it;—

"Upon Thursday, which was the 10th of January, the bishop of London sent for me, Thomas Whittle, minister out of the porter's lodge, where I had been all night, lying upon the earth, upon a pallet, where I had as painful a night of sickness as ever I had, God

be thanked. And when I came before him, he talked with me many things of the sacrament so grossly, as is not worthy to be rehearsed. And amongst other things he asked me if I would have come to mass that morning, if he had sent for me. Whereunto I answered, that I would have come to him at his commandment, 'but to your mass,' said I, 'I have small affection.' At which answer he was displeased sore, and said, I should be fed with bread and water. And as I followed him through the great hall, he turned back and beat me with his fist, first on the one cheek, and then on the other, as the sign of my beating did many days appear. And then he led me into a little salt-house, where I had no straw nor bed, but lay two nights on a table, and slept soundly, I thank God.

"Then, upon the Friday next after, I was brought to my lord, and he then gave me many fair words, and said he would be good to me. And so he, going to Fulham, committed me to Dr. Harpsfield, that he and I in that afternoon should commune together, and draw out certain articles, whereunto if I would subscribe, I should be dismissed. But Dr. Harpsfield sent not for me till night, and then persuaded me very sore to forsake my opinions."—*Fox*, vii. 719.

In fact Harpsfield succeeded; and Thomas Whittle subscribed the recantation. But it was followed by almost immediate remorse, "The night after I had subscribed," he says, "I was sore grieved, and for sorrow of conscience could not sleep." And he goes on;—

"Both with disquietness of mind, and with my other cruel handling, I was sickly, lying upon the ground when the keeper came; and so I desired him to pray Dr. Harpsfield to come to me, and so he did.

"And when he came, and the Registrar with him, I told him that I was not well at ease; but especially I told him I was grieved very much in my conscience and mind, because I had subscribed. And I said that my conscience had so accused me, through the just judgment of God and his word, that I had felt hell in my conscience, and Satan ready to devour me: 'and therefore I pray you, master Harpsfield,' said I, 'let me have the bill again, for I will not stand to it.' So he gently commanded it to be fetched, and gave it to me, and suffered me to put out my name, whereof I was right glad when I had so done although death should follow."—*Fox*, vii. 720.

Fox has preserved copies of two letters which Harpsfield and the Registrar wrote at this time to the bishop in which they mention these circumstances. Harpsfield, after what relates to other business, says;—

"Master Johnson and I have travailed with the priest and he hath subscribed his name to this draught which is herein inclosed, and hath promised he will stand to the same before your lordship.

"When I had written thus much, suddenly came tidings to me, that *Jordanis conversus est retrorsum.* Cluney coming to the priest, found him lying prostrate, and groaning as though he should have died forthwith. Then Cluney took him up, and set him upon a stool, and came to me, and told me of this revel. It chanced that master Johnson was with me, and we went to this fond heretic, and found him lying all along, holding his hands up, and looking hypocritically towards heaven. I caused Thomas More and Cluney to set him on the stool, and with much ado at length he told me, that Satan had been with him in the night, and told him that he was damned; and weeping he prayed master Johnson and me, to see the bill whereunto he subscribed; and when he saw it, he tore out his name, *è libro scilicet viventium.* Me thinketh by him, he will needs burn a faggot."—*Fox*, vii. 721.

The letter of Robert Johnson, the Bishop's Registrar, begins thus;—

"My bounden duty premised, pleaseth your lordship to understand, that this last Friday in the afternoon, master archdeacon of London did diligently travail with sir Thomas Whittle. I being present, and perceiving his conformity, as outwardly appeared, devised this submission, and he being content therewith did subscribe the same. But now, this Saturday morning, master archdeacon and I, upon Cluney's report, declaring that he feigned himself to be distracted of his senses, went unto him, to whom he declared that Satan in the night time appeared unto him, and said that he was damned, for that he had done against his conscience in subscribing to the said submission; with other like words, etc. And then master Archdeacon, at his earnest request, delivered unto him the submission. And thereupon the said Whittle did tear out his subscription, made in the foot of the same, as your lordship shall perceive by the submission sent now unto your lordship by master archdeacon; wherewith the said Whittle was somewhat quieted."—*Fox*, vii. 721.

After all this it may be imagined that the case of Thomas Whittle presents nothing more with relation to the matters respecting which we are inquiring. Fox gives an account of his last examination before Bonner on the 14th of January, and of his execution on the 27th.

(77.) BARTLET GREEN. It is only necessary to add to the account already given[5] of this martyr, what was then purposely omitted as irrelevant to the matter under discussion. Fox tells us that the Council suspected him not only of treason but of heresy, and therefore "examined him upon his faith in religion, but upon what points is not certainly known."

[5] See p. 78, n.

"Nevertheless (as it seemeth) his answers were such as little pleased them (especially the anointed sort); and therefore, after they had long detained him in prison, as well in the Tower of London as elsewhere, they sent him at last unto Bonner bishop of London, to be ordered according to his ecclesiastical law; as appeareth by their letters sent unto the bishop, with the said prisoner also, wherein it may appear, that sir John Bourne (then secretary to the queen) was a chief stirrer in such cases, yea and an enticer of others of the Council; who otherwise (if for fear they durst) would have been content to have let such matters alone. The Lord forgive them their weakness (if it be his good pleasure) and give them true repentance. Amen.

"A Letter sent unto Bonner, Bishop of London, by the Queen's Council, dated the 11th. Day of November, 1555; but not delivered until the 17th. of the same Month.

"After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship, we send to the same herewith the body of one Bartlet Green, who hath of good time remained in the Tower for his obstinate standing in matters against the catholic religion, whom the king's and queen's majesties' pleasures are (because he is of your lordship's diocese), ye shall cause to be ordered according to the laws in such cases provided. And thus we bid your lordship heartily farewell.

"From St. James's, the 11th. of November, 1555.

Your good lordship's loving friends,

Winchester, Pembroke, Thomas Ely,
William Hayward, John Bourne, Thomas Wharton,

"Postscript.—I, sir John Bourne, will wait upon your lordship, and signify further the king's and queen's majesties' pleasure herein." —*Fox*, vii. 733.

In his own "Rehearsal of his Handling," as he wrote it in a letter to Philpot, he says;—

"The 17th day of November, being brought hither by two of the clock at afternoon, I was presented before my lord of London and other two bishops, master Deane, master Roper, master Welch, Dr. Harpsfield archdeacon of London, and other two or three, all sitting at one table. There were also present Dr. Dale, master George Mordant, master Dee. Then after the bishop of London had read unto himself the letter that came from the Council, he spake with more words, but (as I remember) to this effect; that the cause of their assembly was: to hear mine examination, whereunto he had authority by the Council; and had provided master Welch, and another whose name I know not (but well I remember, though he obtained it not, yet desired he my lord, that I might hear the Council's letters), to be there if any matters of the common law should arise, to discuss them: he entreated my lord to determine all controversies of Scripture; and as for the civil law, he and Dr. Dale should take it on them."—*Fox*, vii. 734.

Then followed the conversation about the cause of his

imprisonment which has been already mentioned[6]. After this, there was "much talk to no purpose;" and then a private discourse with master Welch; who, he says, "rose up, desiring leave to talk with me alone." At length, after Green had told him that he did but lose his labour,—

"'Why then,' quoth Welch, 'what shall I report to my lord?' 'Even as pleaseth you,' said I; 'or else you may say that I would be glad to learn, if I had books on both sides.'

"So he going in, the bishops (even then risen, and ready to depart) asked how he liked me? He answered, 'In faith, my lord, he will be glad to learn.' Which words when they were taken, lest they should mistake his meaning and mine, I said, 'Yea, my lord, so that I may have books on both sides, as Calvin, and my lord of Canterbury's books, and such others.' 'Well,' quoth my lord, 'I will satisfy thy mind therein also.' And they all were in great hope that shortly I should become a good catholic, as they call it.

"Then was I brought into my lord's inner chamber (where you were), and there was put into a chamber with master Dee, who entreated me very friendly. That night I supped at my lord's table, and lay with master Dee in the chamber you did see. On the morrow I was served at dinner from my lord's table, and at night did eat in the hall with his gentlemen; where I have been placed ever since, and fared wonderfully well. Yea, to say the truth, I had my liberty within the bounds of his lordship's house: for my lodging and fare, scarce have I been at any time abroad in better case so long together, and have found so much gentleness of my lord, and his chaplains, and other servants, that I should easily have forgotten that I was in prison, were it not that this great cheer was often powdered with unsavoury sauces of examinations, exhortations, posings, and disputations."—*Fox*, vii. 736.

Fox proceeds to give an account of Green's "Last Examination," wherein, "using laws as a cloak of his 'tyranny, the 27th day of November the said bishop 'examined him upon certain points of the Christian 'religion: whereunto, when he had answered, the bishop 'appointed the registrar (as their most common manner is) 'to draw thereout an order of confession;" which was signed by the prisoner. But, though this proceeding of the 27th of November is thus headed, the historian, after giving the confession, proceeds;—

"Many sundry conferences and public examinations they brought him unto. But in the end (seeing his steadfastness of faith to be such, as against the which neither their threatenings, nor yet their flattering promises could prevail), the 15th. day of January the

[6] P. 78, n. before

bishop caused him, with the rest above named, to be brought into the consistory in Paul's; where, being set in his judgment seat, accompanied with Fecknam, then dean of the same church, and other his chaplains, after he had condemned the other six, he then, calling for Bartlet Green, began with these, or the like words:

"Honourable audience, I think it best to open unto you the conversation of this man, called Bartlet Green. And because you shall not charge me that I go about to seek any man's blood, here you shall hear the Council's letters, which they sent with him unto me. The effect whereof is, that whereas he had been of long time in the Tower of London for heresy, they have now sent him unto me to be ordered, according to the laws thereof provided. And now to thee, Bartlet Green, I propose these nine articles,' &c.—*Fox*, vii. 738.

I think even the reader of these extracts (and still more any one who studies the whole of Green's long story) will be of opinion that the reporter had not that admirable "gift of modesty" which he so admired in the subject of his narrative. The passage must in fairness be given, as it contains an account of one of the peculiar cases of cruelty. Fox indeed affects some difficulty in believing the cruel part; but for myself I can easily imagine that, amidst the "much gentleness" and "great cheer" with which he was treated, this lively young templar might on some occasion provoke Bonner to give him as good a threshing as Dr. Squires got from his father-in-law, or his namesake Thomas Greene from Dr. Story[7].

"So great and admirable was this gift of modesty grafted in the nature of him, so far abhorring from all pride and arrogancy, that as he could not abide any thing that was spoken to his advancement or praise; so neither did there appear in him any show or brag in those things wherein he might justly glory, which were his punishments and sufferings for the cause and quarrel of Christ. For when he was beaten and scourged with rods by bishop Bonner (which scarce any man would believe, nor I neither, but that I heard it of him, which heard it out of his mouth), and he greatly rejoiced in the same, yet his shamefaced modesty was such, that never he would express any mention thereof, lest he should seem to glory too much in himself, save that only he opened the same to

[7] See before, p. 155 and 21. The "chapter concerning such as were scourged and whipped by the papists in the true cause of Christ's Gospel," viii. 516, is beneath criticism, or it would afford room for a good deal. All that relates to Bonner, however, is answered by that prelate's simple and obvious reply to one who reproached him on the subject—which was to the effect that, if it had been the reprover's own case, he would have thought it a good commutation of penance to have had his body beaten, rather than burned. See Wood's Athenæ. Bliss Ed. vol. i. 372.

one master Cotton of the Temple, a friend of his, a little before his death."—*Fox*, vii. 742.

RICHARD WOODMAN, an iron-maker of Warbleton, Sussex, who was burned at Lewes on the 22nd of June 1557, does not properly belong to our list. So far as regards his examinations, and sentence, in respect of the particular offences for which he suffered, the Bishop of London seems to have had nothing to do with him. But we must notice his case, on account of his "apprehension, first by his enemies, and of his deliverance out of bishop Bonner's hands," rather than because "of his second taking again by 'the procurement of his Father, Brother, Kinsfolks, and 'friends; also of his sundry examinations and courageous 'answers before the Bishops," who then took him in hand, of whom Bonner was not one. The account of him in Fox is very long and curious; but with only such extracts of a small part as can be admitted on this occasion or as indeed are required for our present purpose it is impossible to do greater justice to the matter or to present it in a more interesting form, than by giving one or two specimens of "A True Certificate" which he wrote, containing a particular account of his troubles.

"Gentle reader here you shall perceive how the Scriptures be partly fulfilled on me, being one of the least of his poor lambs. First, you shall understand, that since I was delivered out of the bishop of London's hands, which was in the year of our Lord 1555, and the same day that master Philpot was burned, which was on the 18th of December, I lay in his coal-house eight weeks lacking but one day: and, before that, I was a year and a half almost in the King's Bench after my first apprehension, for reproving a preacher in the pulpit, in the parish of Warbleton, where I dwelt. Wherefore I was at two Sessions before I was sent to prison, and carried to two more sessions while I was in prison, twice before the bishop of Chichester, and five times before the commissioners; and then sent to London's coal-house, and many times called before him, as it appeareth by my examinations which I have wrote, the which examinations the bishop of Chichester now hath, for they were found in my house when I was taken; wherein is contained all the talk which I had before them aforenamed. Also there be in London that had copies of the same of me, when I was in the coal-house.

"And it pleased God to deliver me with four more out of the butcher's hands, requiring nothing else of us but that we should be honest men, and members of the true catholic church that was builded upon the prophets and apostles, Christ being the head of the true church, the which all we affirmed that we were members of the true church, and purposed by God's help therein to die. And

hereupon we were delivered; but he willed us many times to speak good of him. And no doubt he was worthy to be praised, because he had been so faithful an aid in his master the devil's business; for he had burnt good master Philpot the same morning, in whose blood his heart was so drunken (as I supposed), that he could not tell what he did, as it appeared to us both before and after. For but two days before, he promised us that we should be condemned that same day that we were delivered, yea, and the morrow after that he had delivered us, he sought for some of us again, yea and that earnestly. He waxed dry after his great drunkenness, wherefore he is like to have blood to drink in hell as he is worthy, if he repent it not with speed. The Lord turn all their hearts, if it be his will!"—*Fox*, viii. 334.

Putting this into plain English it seems to mean that Richard Woodman had been sent up to London for disturbing divine service in his parish church about Midsummer 1554; that is, at the time when Thomas Tomkins was making hay at Fulham; a work in which he might have been so happy as to share if he had not been confined in the King's Bench in the diocese of Winchester until long afterwards. When at length he was brought before the Bishop of London, and had undergone several examinations of which we have no account, he appears to have abjured; and, after some detention, the cause of which is unexplained, to have been set at liberty. He does not however put the matter quite in this light himself, but tells us,

"After I was delivered, the papists said that I had consented to them, whereof they made themselves glad; the which was the least part of my thought (I praise God therefore), as they well perceived and knew the contrary within a while. For I went from parish to parish, and talked with them, to the number of thirteen or fourteen, and that of the chiefest in all the country; and I angered them so, that they with the commissioners complained on me to my lord chamberlain that was then to the queen, sir John Gage, shewing him that I baptized children, and married folks, with many such lies, to bring me into their hands again. Then the commissioners sent out certain citations to bring me to the court. My lord chamberlain had directed out four or five warrants for me, that if I had come there, I should have been attached and sent to prison straightway; which was not God's will; for I had warning of their laying await for me, and came not there, but sent my deputy, and he brought me word that the bailiffs waited for me there; but they missed of their prey for that time, whereupon they were displeased." —*Fox* viii. 334.

It would be long to recount how he concealed himself in England, fled to Flanders and France, but speedily returned,

and as soon as "it was once known among Baal's priests, they could not abide it but procured out warrants" against him and caused his house to be searched, sometimes twice in a week, till at length he fell into their hands. With all this Bonner had nothing, and therefore we have nothing, to do. But a short extract from his first examination before Dr. Christopherson, bishop of Chichester, Dr. Story, Dr. Cooke and others on the 14th of April 1557 is somewhat to our purpose.

"*Story.* 'My lord, send him to prison, you shall do no good with him. I will go to church, and leave you here. This is an old heretic. Wast thou never before me ere now?'

"*Woodman.* 'Yes, forsooth, that I have.'

"*Story.* 'Yea, I trow so; and I sent thee to the bishop of London, and he released thee; and thou promisedst him to be an honest man, and that thou wouldst be of the true catholic church; which thou hast not fulfilled.'

"*Woodman.* 'I promised him nothing but I have fulfilled it. No man shall be able to prove the contrary.'

"*Story.* 'Well, it will be tried well enough. My lord, I will take my leave, I fear me you shall do this man no good.'"—*Fox*, viii. 340.

It is impossible to pursue our subject more effectively than by an extract from his account of his fourth examination which was "had before the bishop of Winchester, bishop of Rochester and a certain doctor with divers other priests and gentlemen, the 25th day of May;"—

"I was fetched from the Marshalsea to the said bishops and priests, sitting in St. George's Church in Southwark, by one of the marshal's men and one of the sheriff's men. When I came before them, and had done my duty to them as nigh as I could, then said the bishop of Winchester, 'What is your name?'

"*Woodman.* 'My name is Richard Woodman, forsooth.'

"*Winchester.* 'Ah, Woodman! you were taken and apprehended for heresy about three years agone, and were sent to prison in the King's Bench, and there remained a long time. Mine old lord of Chichester, being a learned famous man, well known in this realm of England, and almost throughout all Christendom, I think, came to prison to you; and there, and at other places, called you before him divers times, travailing and persuading with you many times (because he was your ordinary) to pluck you from your heresies that you held; but he could by no means advertise you. Whereupon you were delivered to the commissioners; and they could do no good with you neither. Then they sent you unto my lord of London. My lord of London calling you before him divers times, labour was made unto him of your friends, that you might be released. My Lord, having a good hope in you, that you would become an honest

man, because he had heard so of you in times past, yea and you yourself promising him, that you would go home and recant your heresies that you held, delivered you; sending also a letter of your recantation to the commissary, that he should see it done. But as soon as you were out of his hands, you were as bad as ever you were, and would never fulfil your promise, but have hid yourself in the woods, bushes, dens, and caves; and thus have you continued ever since, till it was now of late. Then the sheriff of that shire (being a worshipful man) hearing thereof, sent certain of his men, and took you in a wood, and so carried you to his house. I cannot tell his name. What is your sheriff's name?'

"*Woodman.* 'Forsooth, his name is sir Edward Gage.'

"*Winchester.* 'Well, you were apprehended for heresy; and being at master Gage's three weeks or more, ye were gently entreated there; he and other gentlemen persuading with you divers times, little prevailed. Then you appealed to the bishop of Chichester that now is. The sheriff, like a worshipful man, sent you to him, and he hath travailed with you, and others also, and can do no good with you; whereupon we have sent for you.'

"Then I spake to him; for I thought he would be long, before he would make an end. I thought he was a year in telling of those lies that he had told there against me already. Yea, I kept silence from good words, but it was great pain and grief to me, as David said. At length the fire was so kindled within my heart, that I could not choose but speak with my tongue; for I feared lest any of the company should have departed or ever I had answered to his lies, and so the gospel to have been slandered by my long silence keeping. So I spake, I praise God there-for, and said, 'My lord: I pray you let me now answer for myself, for it is time.'

"*Winchester.* 'I permit you to answer to these things that I have said.'

"*Woodman.* 'I thank God there-for. And I think myself happy (as Paul said, when he was brought before king Agrippa), that I may this day answer for myself. My lord! I promise you there is never a word of your sayings true, that you have alleged against me.'

"*Winchester.* 'I cannot tell, but thus it is reported of you. As for me, I never did see you before this day; but I am sure it is not all lies that I have said, as you report.'

"*Woodman.* 'Yes, my lord, there is never a true word of that you have said. And further, whereas you said you never saw me before this day, you have both heard me, and seen me, I dare say, before this day.'

"*Winchester.* 'I think I heard you indeed on Sunday, when[8] you played the malapert fellow; but I cannot tell that I saw you. But I pray you, were you not taken in the woods by the sheriff's men?'

---

[8] "Where," ed. 1597. That is, at St. Mary Overys. As the reader will see farther allusion to it presently, it may be worth while to quote Machyn's account;—"The xxiii day dyd pryche the Bysshope of Wynchaster Doctur Whytt at Sant Mare Overes in Sowthwarke, and ther was a heretyke ther for to here the sermon."—p. 136.

"*Woodman.* 'No sure, I was taken beside my house, I being in my house when they came: wherefore that is not true.'

"*Winchester.* 'Were not you at the sheriff's three weeks?'

"*Woodman.* 'Yes, that I was, a month just, and was gently entreated of him, I can say no otherwise; for I had meat and drink enough, and fair words.'

"*Winchester.* 'Ah! I am well apaid; it is not all lies then, as it chanced. For I spake but of three weeks, and you confess a month yourself.'

"*Woodman.* 'Yet your tale is never the truer for that. For you said, I was there three weeks for heresy, the which is not so. For I was not apprehended for heresy at the first, neither did mine old lord of Chichester travail with me to pull me from heresy, as you said; for I held none then, neither do I now, as God knoweth; neither was I sent to the commissioners, nor to the bishop of London for heresy; neither was I delivered to him for any such thing, nor promised him to recant, as you said I did. Wherefore I marvel you be not ashamed to tell so many lies, being a bishop, that should be an ensample to others.'

"*Winchester.* 'Lo, what an arrogant heretic this same is. He will deny God; for he that denieth his own hand, denieth God.'

"*Woodman.* "My lord, judge not lest you be judged yourself. For as you have judged me, you shall be judged; if you repent not. And if I have set my hand to any recantation, let it be seen to my shame, before this audience; for I will never deny mine own hand, by God's help.'

"*Winchester.* 'It is not here now but I think it will be had well enough; but if it cannot be found, *by whom will you be tried?*'

"*Woodman.* '*Even by my lord of London; for he dealt like a good man with me in that matter that I was sent to prison for.* For it was upon the breach of a statute, as master sheriff here can tell; for he was sheriff then, as he is now, and can tell how I was tossed up and down from sessions to sessions. And because I would not consent that I had offended therein, they sent me to prison again. Then my lord of Chichester, being mine ordinary, and I being his tenant, came to me, to persuade with me that I should have consented to them, and to find myself in fault, where I was in none. To the which I would not agree, and I desired him that he would see me released of my wrong; but he said he could not, but willed me or my friends to speak to the commissioners for me, because it was a temporal matter. And when I came before them, they sent me to my lord of London; and my lord of London was certified by the hands of almost thirty men, esquires, gentlemen, and yeomen, the chiefest in all the country where I dwelt, that I had not offended in the matter that I was sent to prison for. Whereupon he delivered me, not willing me to recant heresies, for I held none (as God knoweth), neither do I now; nor do I know wherefore I was sent to prison, no more than any man here knoweth; for I was taken away from my work.'

"*Winchester.* 'No? wherefore appealed you then to my lord of Chichester, if it were not for heresy?'

"*Woodman.* 'Because there was laid to my charge that I had

baptized children and married folks; the which I never did, for I was no where minister. Wherefore I appealed to mine ordinary, to purge myself thereof; as I have. Wherefore, if any man have anything against me, let him speak; for I came not hither to accuse myself, neither will I.'

"*Winchester.* 'Master Sheriff, can you tell me upon what breach of the statute[9] he was sent to prison first?'

"*The Sheriff.* 'Yes, forsooth, my lord; that I can.'

"*Woodman.* 'My lord, if you will give me leave, I will show you the whole matter.'

"*Winchester.* 'Nay, master sheriff, I pray you tell the matter, seeing you know it.'

"*The Sheriff.* 'My lord, it was for speaking to a curate in the pulpit, as I remember.'

"*Winchester.* 'Ah! like enough, that he would not stick to reprove a curate: for did you not see how he fashioned himself to speak to me in the pulpit on Sunday? He[1] played the malapert fellow with me; and therefore it was no great marvel though he played that part with another.'

"*Woodman.* 'Why, you will not blame me for that, I am sure: for we spake for no other cause, but to purge ourselves of those heresies that you laid to our charge,'" &c.—*Fox*, viii. 363.

At his next examination, which was, he says, "had before 'the bishop of Winchester, the Archdeacon of Canterbury, 'Dr. Langdale, with a fat headed priest and others, whose 'names I know not, with certain also of the commissioners, 'at St. Mary Overy's Church in Southwark in the presence 'of three hundred people at the least, the 15th day of June, 'anno 1557;" the subject having been renewed respecting the original charge brought against him.

"'Wherefore my lord of London, seeing me have so much wrong, did like a good man to me in that matter, and released me. Now when I had told you this matter, you bade the sheriff have me away; you said, you were glad I held against priest's marriages, because I answered to the question you asked me.'

"*The fat Priest.* 'My lord, do you not hear what he saith by my lord of London? He saith he is a good man in that he released him; but he meaneth that he is good in nothing else.'

"*Woodman.* 'What! can you tell what I mean? Let every man say as he findeth; he did justly to me in that matter. I say, if he be not good in any thing else, as you say, he shall answer for it, and not I; for I have nothing to do with other men's matters.'"—*Fox*, viii. 367.

These extracts, which form but a very small part of more than forty pages of close printing devoted to the history of

[9] "Breach of statute," ed. 1597.

[1] "You," ed. 1597.

Richard Woodman in the Martyrology[2], comprise, I believe, all that relates to our enquiry; proceeding in which I am not aware of anything that should detain us until we come to the case of,

(217.) RALPH ALLERTON, who is, I think, the next of Bonner's prisoners to whom we are indebted for an account of his personal transactions with the bishop. Fox introduces it by telling us that

"Ralph Allerton was, more than a year before his condemnation, apprehended and brought before the lord Darcy of Chiche; and was there accused, as well for that he would not consent and come unto the idolatry and superstition which then was used, as also that he had by preaching enticed others to do the like.

"Being then hereupon examined, he confessed that he, coming into his parish-church of Bentley, and seeing the people sitting there, either gazing about, or else talking together, he exhorted them that they would fall unto prayer, and meditation of God's most holy word, and not sit still idly: whereunto they willingly consented. Then, after prayer ended, he read unto them a chapter of the New Testament, and so departed. In the which exercise he continued until Candlemas, and then, being informed that he might not so do by the law (for that he was no priest or minister), he left off, and kept himself close in his house until Easter then next after, at what time certain sworn men for the inquiry of such matters came unto his house, and attached him for reading in the parish of Weeley. But when they understood that he had read but once, and that it was of obedience (whereunto he earnestly moved the people), they let him for that time depart. Notwithstanding, for fear of their cruelty, he was not long after constrained to forsake his own house, and keep himself in woods, barns, and other solitary places, until the time of his apprehension.

"After his examination, the lord Darcy sent him up to the council; but they (not minding to trouble themselves with him) sent him unto Bonner, who, by threatenings and other subtle means, so abused the simple and fearful heart of this man (as yet not thoroughly staid upon the aid and help of God), that within short time he won him to his most wicked will, and made him openly at Paul's Cross to revoke and recant his former profession, and thereupon set him at liberty of body; which yet brought such a bondage and terror of soul and conscience, and so cast him down, that except the Lord (whose mercies are immeasurable) had supported and lifted him up again, he had perished for ever. But the Lord, who never suffereth his elect children utterly to fall, casting his pitiful eyes upon this lost sheep, with his merciful and fatherly chastisements, did (with Peter) raise him up again, giving unto him not only hearty and unfeigned repentance, but also a most constant boldness to profess again (even unto the death) his most holy name

[2] Vol. viii. p. 333—376.

and glorious gospel. Wherefore, at the procurement of one Thomas Tye, a priest, sometime an earnest professor of Christ, but now a fierce persecutor of the same (as appeareth more at large before, in the history of William Mount and his wife), he was again apprehended, and sent up again unto Bonner, before whom he was the 8th day of April and sundry other times else examined. The report of which examination, written by his own hand, with blood for lack of other ink, hereafter followeth."—*Fox*, viii. 405.

The beginning of the First Examination is as follows;

"*Bonner.* 'Ah sirrah! how chanceth it that you are come hither again on this fashion? I dare say thou art accused wrongfully.'

"*Ralph.* 'Yea, my lord, so I am. For if I were guilty of such things as I am accused of, then I would be very sorry.'

"*Bonner.* 'By St. Mary that is not well done. But let me hear, Art thou an honest man? for if I can prove no heresy by thee, then shall thine accusers do thee no harm at all. Go to, let me hear thee: for I did not believe the tale to be true.'

"*Ralph.* 'My lord, who did accuse me? I pray you let me know, and what is mine accusation, that I may answer thereunto.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ah, wilt thou so? Before God, if thou hast not dissembled, then thou needest not be afraid, nor ashamed to answer for thyself. But tell me in faith, hast thou not dissembled?'

"*Ralph.* 'If I cannot have mine accusers to accuse me before you, my conscience doth constrain me to accuse myself before you: for I confess that I have grievously offended God in my dissimulation, at my last being before your lordship, for the which I am right sorry, as God knoweth.'

"*Bonner.* 'Wherein, I pray thee, didst thou dissemble, when thou wast before me?'

"*Ralph.* 'Forsooth, my lord, if your lordship remember, I did set my hand upon a certain writing, the contents whereof (as I remember) were, "That I did believe in all things as the catholic church teacheth," etc. In the which I did not disclose my mind, but shamefully dissembled, because I made no difference between the true church and the untrue church.'

"*Bonner.* 'Nay, but I pray thee let me hear more of this gear; for I fear me thou wilt smell of a heretic anon. Which is the true church, as thou sayest? Dost thou not call the heretics' church the true church, or the catholic church of Christ? Now, which of these two is the true church, sayest thou? Go to, for in faith I will know of thee ere I leave thee.'

"*Ralph.* 'As concerning the church of heretics, I utterly abhor the same, as detestable and abominable before God, with all their enormities and heresies: and the church catholic is it that I only embrace, whose doctrine is sincere, pure, and true.'

"*Bonner.* 'By St. Augustine, but that is well said of thee: for, by God Almighty, if thou hadst allowed the church of heretics, I would have burned thee with fire for thy labour.'

"Then said one Morton a priest, 'My lord, you know not yet what church it is, that he calleth catholic. I warrant you he meaneth naughtily enough.'

"*Bonner.* 'Think you so? Now by our blessed Lady, if it be so, he might have deceived me. How say you, sirrah! which is the catholic church?'

"*Ralph.* 'Even that which hath received the wholesome sound, spoken of Isaiah, David, Malachi, and Paul, with many other more. The which sound, as it is written, hath gone throughout all the earth in every place, and unto the ends of the world.'

"*Bonner.* 'Yea, thou sayest true before God: for this is the sound that hath gone throughout all Christendom.'"—*Ibid.* 406.

This naturally led to a discourse about the catholic church, in which the prisoner freely expressed his opinion that the gospel had been preached and persecuted in all lands; "first 'in Jewry by the Scribes and Pharisees, and since that time 'by Nero, Dioclesian, and such like, and now here, in these 'our days, by your lordship knoweth whom." Fox enjoyed this "privy nip" too much to run any risk of the reader's losing the humour of it, and so he put a marginal note, "He meaneth belike Bonner and his fellows." But I quote the following passage, partly because it is alluded to by Strype, and goes towards forming part of his ground for what I really believe to be a misrepresentation[3]; and still more because it gives the martyr's own testimony on several points of interest in our inquiry. Allerton went on to say;—

"For truth it is that the church which you call catholic, is none otherwise catholic than was figured in Cain, observed of Jeroboam, Ahab, Jezebel, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, Herod, with innumerable more of the like; and as both Daniel and Esdras make mention of these last days by a plain prophecy, and now fulfilled, as appeareth, and affirmed by our Saviour Christ and his apostles, saying, 'There shall come grievous wolves to devour the flock.'

"*Bonner.* 'Now, by the blessed sacrament of the altar, master Morton, he is the rankest heretic that ever came before me. How say you? have you heard the like?'

"*Morton.* 'I thought what he was, my lord, at the first, I—'

"*Bonner.* 'Now, by All-hallows, thou shalt be burnt with fire for thy lying, thou whoreson varlet and prick-louse, thou! Dost thou find a prophecy in Daniel of us? Nay, you knave, it is of you that he speaketh, and of your false pretensed holiness. Go to, let me hear what is the saying of Esdras, and take heed ye make not a lie, I advise you.'

[3] "He was a tailor by trade, as I conjecture by Boner's *often* calling him 'pricklouse,' according to his rude way of misnaming those who came before him."—*Mem.* Vol. III. pt. ii. p. 63. I believe the word occurs only in the two passages which I have quoted; and as to any rude way of misnaming those who came before him, I shall not believe that the bishop had any such until I see farther proof than I have yet met with.

"*Ralph.* 'The saying of Esdras is this: 'The heat of a great multitude is kindled over you, and they shall take away certain of you, and feed the idols with you. And he that consenteth unto them, shall be had in derision, laughed to scorn, and trodden under foot. Yea, they shall be like madmen, for they shall spare no man; they shall spoil and waste such as fear the Lord,' etc.'

"*Bonner.* 'And have you taken this thing to make your market good? Ah sirrah, wilt thou so? by my faith, a pretty instruction, and a necessary thing to be taught among the people. By my troth, I think there be more[4] of this opinion. I pray thee tell me: is there any that understandeth this Scripture on this fashion? Before God, I think there be none in all England but thou.'

"*Ralph.* 'Yes, my lord, there are in England three religions.'

"*Bonner.* 'Sayest thou so? Which be those three?'

"*Ralph.* 'The first is that which you hold; the second is *clean contrary* to the same; and the third is a neuter, being indifferent—that is to say, observing all things that are commanded outwardly, as though he were of your part, his heart being set wholly against the same.'

"*Bonner.* 'And of these three, which art thou? for now thou must needs be of one of them.'

"*Ralph.* 'Yea, my lord, *I am of one of them;* and that which I am of, is even that which is *contrary* to that which you teach to be believed under pain of death.'

"*Bonner.* 'Ah sir, you were here with me at Fulham, and had good cheer, yea, and money in your purse when you went away; and by my faith I had a favour unto thee, but now I see thou wilt be a naughty knave. Why, wilt thou take upon thee to read the Scripture, and canst understand never a word? for thou hast brought a text of Scripture, the which maketh clean against thee. For Esdras speaketh of the multitude of you heretics, declaring your hate against the catholic church, making the simple or idle people believe, that all is idolatry that we do; and so entice them away until you have overcome them."—*Fox*, viii. 407.

Allerton went on in a strain of high invective; telling the bishop that his was "the bloody church, figured in Cain the tyrant," till Bonner's patience seems to have been exhausted; and he cried, "Have the knave away! Let him be carried to the Little-Ease, at London, until I come." This, it appears, was done; and on the next day Allerton was again called before the bishop; his former recantation was produced; and he was examined whether, since the time when he had signed it, he had been "at mass, matins &c." To this he replied that he "had not been at mass, matins, nor any other strange worshipping of God;" but

[4] I presume it should be "no more," as it is in the editions of 1597 and 1641.

he proceeded to express his belief in the scripture and his reverence for it. Upon this a "Dean," who seems not otherwise to have indicated his presence at the examination, interfered;—

"*Dean.* 'My lord, this fellow will be an honest man, I hear by him. He will not stand in his opinion; for he showeth himself gentle and patient in his talk.'

"*Bonner.* 'Oh, he is a glorious knave! His painted terms shall no more deceive me. Ah, whoreson prick-louse! doth not Christ say, 'This is my body?' and how darest thou deny these words, for to say, as I have a writing to show, and thine own hand at the same? Let me see, wilt thou deny this? Is not this thine own hand?'

"*Ralph.* 'Yes, my lord, it is my own hand; neither am I ashamed thereof, because my confession therein is agreeable to God's word. And whereas you do lay unto my charge that I should deny the words of our Saviour Jesus Christ; O good Lord! from whence cometh this rash, hasty, and untrue judgment? Forsooth not from the Spirit of Truth; for he leadeth men into all truth, and is not the father of liars. Whereupon should your lordship gather or say of me so diffamously? Wherefore, I beseech you, if I deny the Scriptures canonical, or any part thereof, then let me die.'

"*Tye, the Priest.* 'My lord, he is a very seditious fellow, and persuadeth other men to do as he himself doth, contrary to the order appointed by the queen's highness and the clergy of this realm. For a great sort of the parish will be gathered one day to one place, and another day to another place, to hear him; so that very few come to the church to hear divine service. And this was not only before that he was taken and brought unto the council, but also since his return home again, and he hath done much harm: for where both men and women were honestly disposed before, by St. Anne now are they as ill as he almost. And furthermore, he was not ashamed to withstand me before all the parish, saying, that we were of the malignant church of Antichrist, and not of the true church of Christ, alleging a great many of scriptures to serve for his purpose, saying, 'Good people, take heed, and beware of these blood-thirsty dogs,' etc. And then I commanded the constable to apprehend him, and so he did. Nevertheless, after his apprehension, the constable let him go about his business all the next day; so that without putting in of sureties, he let him go into Suffolk and other places, for no goodness I warrant you, my lord. It were alms to teach such officers their duty, how they should not let such rebels go at their own liberty, after that they be apprehended and taken; but to keep them fast in the stocks until they bring them before a justice."—*Fox*, viii. 408.

At length this examination of the 24th of April was terminated by the bishop's asking, "How say you, sirrah? tell 'me briefly at one word: wilt thou be contented to go to 'Fulham with me, and there to kneel thee down at mass,

'showing thyself outwardly as though thou didst it with a 'good will? Go to, speak." Allerton replied, "I will not say so!" and the bishop rejoined, "Away with him! away with him!" and so another week passed, and then he tells us;—

"The 2d day of May I was brought before the bishop, and three noblemen of the council, whose names I do not remember.

"*Bonner.* 'Lo, my lords! this same is the fellow that was sent unto me from the council, and did submit himself, so that I had half a hope of him: but, by St. Anne, I was always in doubt of him. Nevertheless, he was with me, and fared well, and when I delivered him, I gave him money in his purse. How sayest thou, was it not so as I tell my lords here?'

"*Ralph.* 'Indeed, my lord, I had meat and drink enough; but I never came in bed all the while. And at my departing you gave me twelve pence, howbeit I never asked none, nor would have done.'

"*A Lord.* 'Be good to him, my lord. He will be an honest man.'

"*Bonner.* 'Before God, how should I trust him? he hath once deceived me already. But ye shall hear what he will say to the blessed sacrament of the altar. How say you, sirrah? After the words of consecration be spoken by the priest, there remaineth no bread, but the very body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, God and man, and none other substance, under the form of bread?'

"*Ralph.* 'Where find you that, my lord, written?'"—*Fox*, viii. 409.

I have perhaps already given more space than enough to the history of Ralph Allerton. What remains of it, as well as a great deal which has been passed over, is very interesting and instructive with reference to the history of the times; but I do not know that it presents anything particularly relating to the subject of our inquiry, and in fact, very little of what remains of this martyr's history is his own testimony. He tells us indeed, in a few words, that, on Tuesday the 19th of May, he was "brought before the bishops of Rochester and Chichester with others;" and that the former of those prelates asked him, "were you a com-'panion of George Eagles, otherwise called Trudgeover? 'My Lord of London tells me that you were his fellow-'companion?" to which Allerton replied, "I know him very well, my Lord." But after one more question and answer, relating merely to the character of Eagles, he provokingly adds, "The rest of mine examinations you shall 'have when I am condemned, if I can have any time after 'my coming into Newgate, the which I trust shall touch 'the matter *a great deal more plainly;* for the *pithy matters*

'are yet unwritten." What they were I know not, and Fox professes his ignorance whether the martyr ever was able to fulfil this promise. And, indeed, I do not see that much more information to our purpose is to be gained from the martyrology. Perhaps the government thought that a man who had recanted once, might do it again; and therefore kept him in prison, examining him from time to time, until the 17th of September, when he was burned as a relapsed heretic; his companion, George Eagles, having been in the mean time apprehended, and executed as a traitor[5].

(230.) JOHN ROUGH had very little to do with Bishop Bonner, but their intercourse was of such a nature, and has been so represented by Fox, that his case must not be passed over. He was born in Scotland, became a black-friar at Stirling at the age of seventeen, remained so for sixteen years, until the Earl of Arran sued to the Archbishop of St. Andrews to have him out of the order for a chaplain, and accordingly he was set free. After this, he preached the reformed doctrine in Scotland, and the north of England, during the reign of Edward the VI.; and on the accession of Queen Mary he fled, with his wife, into Friesland and dwelt at Norden, making caps, hose, and such like things, until (according to Fox) "lacking yarn, and other such 'necessary provision for the maintenance of his occupation, 'he came over again into England, here to provide for the 'same and the tenth day of November" [1557] "arrived at 'London." It would be less worth while to read Fox's slip-along stories, if he did not so frequently supply us with grounds for believing that, even when he is telling the truth, he is so far from telling the whole truth as to give all the effect of falsehood. Of course, if one stops to think

[5] Strype quotes from the Council-Book "Aug. 3. Where sondrie letters 'had bene before directed to divers justices for the apprehension of one 'Trudgeover, he being taken and executed by Mr. Anthony Browne, Ser-'geant-at-law, in Essex;" [of whom we have heard before in the story of 'William Hunter] "a letter as this day was directed to the said Sergeant 'Browne, geving hym thanks for his diligent proceding against the said 'Trudge: willing hym to distribute his head and quarters according to 'his and his colleagues former determinations, and to procede with his 'complices according to the qualities of their offences."—*Mem.* Vol. III. pt. ii. p. 43. His body was distributed to Colchester, Harwich, St. Osyths, and Chelmsford; at the latter of which places his head was set on the market cross.—*Fox*, viii. 396.

of it, it is rather strange that a man who had fled from England on the mere presentiment of persecution, should, after four years spent in a country resorted to by English fugitives, have been ignorant that the persecution which he had anticipated, and the mere idea of which had driven him into exile, had actually begun, and was raging in England; and at least equally strange that if he knew these facts he should expose himself to such a danger, on such grounds. Unless he had actually used up all the yarn in Holland, and could find no agent, no means of communication with England, no other occupation where he was, one cannot account for such a step. It does, however, seem as if Fox would have us understand that John Rough, notwithstanding what he might have seen or heard of the world at various times and places, did it in perfect ignorance and simplicity; for, after the words which I have quoted respecting his arrival "at London," he immediately proceeds, "where hearing of the secret society and holy congregation 'of God's children there assembled he joined himself unto 'them, and afterwards being elected their minister and 'preacher, did continue most virtuously exercised in that 'godly fellowship, teaching and confirming them in the 'truth and gospel of Christ." It is as strange that the exile of Friesland should only now come to the knowledge of the secret Congregation in London, as that a society thus meeting in peril of their lives should at once give the right hand of fellowship to a stranger dropping in unawares[6]. We have seen what took place with regard to his predecessor Thomas Rose[7]; and we may imagine that during nearly two years which had elapsed since his apprehension their fears and their caution had not diminished. Indeed, the circumstances of Rough's apprehension are very curious, and characteristic; but, before we come to them, we may as well cut this little knot about his introduction to the Congregation by the means which Fox (as I have observed) so frequently furnishes. If his documents did not sometimes explain, or even contradict, his history, we should be oftener

[6] There is a curious felicity in Strype's brief statement of the matter which makes it worth copying: "coming into England for yarn, it so fell out, that he became minister to the congregation of gospellers at London." —*Mem.* Vol. III. pt. ii. p. 45.

[7] See before, p. 338.

at a loss than we are. "The Articles" ministered to John Rough shew that he was known and watched. Indeed, we might suppose that the domestic Chaplain of the "gentlemen who, by the Lord stirred up, brake in suddenly," and "murdered" Cardinal Beaton[8], the old Preacher of the North in King Edward's time, the friend of John Knox, was one of whom the government had never lost sight.

These Articles, however, relate to what John Rough had done since his "*last coming* into England out of the parts beyond the sea," (a phrase which looks as if the government supposed him to have made some previous trips) but the sixth of them is as follows. "Item, thou dost know, and 'hast been conversant with all or a great part of such Eng-'lishmen as have fled out of this realm for religion, and 'hast consented and agreed with them in their opinions, 'and hast succoured, maintained, and holpen them, and 'hast been a conveyer of their seditious letters and books 'into this realm." In reply to this article "he confessed 'that he had been familiar with divers English men and 'women being in Friesland, and agreed with them in 'opinion, as Master Scory, Thomas Young, George Roe and 'others, to the number of one hundred persons which fled 'thither for religion, using there the order set forth in the 'reign of King Edward, and otherwise he denieth the con-'tents of this article."

Whatever view the reader may take of this he will probably be led to think that the parties knew something of each other before the month of November, 1557. It was not long however before the government interfered. The new minister had been scarcely more than a month in England when says Fox:—

"The 12th. day of December, he, with Cutbert Symson and others, through the crafty and traitorous suggestion of a false hypocrite and dissembling brother, called Roger Sergeant a tailor, was apprehended by the vice-chamberlain of the Queen's house, at the Saracen's Head in Islington; where the congregation had then purposed to assemble themselves to their godly and accustomable exercises of prayer, and hearing the word of God: which pretence, for the safeguard of all the rest, they yet at their examinations covered and excused by hearing of a play, that was then appointed to be at that place. The vice-chamberlain, after he had apprehended them, carried Rough and Symson unto the council, who charged

[8] Fox, V. 636. See Spotiswood, p. 84.

them to have assembled together to celebrate the communion or supper of the Lord: and therefore, after sundry examinations and answers, they sent the said Rough unto Newgate; but his examinations they sent unto the bishop of London, with a letter signed with their hands, the copy whereof followeth.

"'A Letter sent from the Queen's Council unto Bonner Bishop of London, touching the Examination of John Rough, Minister.

"'After our hearty commendations to your good lordship, we send you here enclosed, the examination of a Scottish man named John Rough, who, by the queen's majesty's commandment, is presently sent to Newgate; being of the chief of them that upon Sunday last, under the colour of coming to see a play at the Saracen's Head in Islington, had prepared a communion to be celebrated and received there, among certain other seditious and heretical persons. And forasmuch as by the said Rough's examination, containing the story and progress of his former life, it well appeareth of what sort he is; the queen's highness hath willed us to remit him unto your lordship, to the end that being called before you out of prison, as oft as your lordship shall think good, ye may proceed, both to his further examination, and otherwise ordering of him according to the laws, as the case shall require. And thus we bid your lordship heartily well to fare. From St. James, the 15th. day of December, 1557.

"'Your lordship's loving friends

"'Nicholas Ebor. Edward Hastings, John Bourne,
F. Shrewsbury, Anthony Montague, Henry Jernegam.

"Bonner, now minding to make quick despatch, did within three days after the receipt of the letter (the 18th. day of December), send for this Rough out of Newgate, and in his palace at London ministered unto him twelve articles," &c.—*Fox*, viii. 444.

Of these articles I have given a sufficient specimen; and I only add what relates to his personal ill-treatment by the bishop; for that is, indeed, the principal reason for mentioning him at all. Fox tells us that "The Friday at night 'before Master Rough minister of the Congregation (of 'whom mention is made before) was taken, being in his bed, 'he dreamed that he saw two of the guard leading Cuthbert 'Symson, deacon of the said Congregation . . . . the next 'day following in the night, the said master Rough had 'another dream in his sleep concerning his own trouble; 'the matter whereof was this. He thought in his dream 'that he was carried himself forcibly to the bishop, and that 'the bishop plucked off his beard and cast it into the fire 'saying these words 'Now I may say I have had a piece of 'a heretic burned in my house:' and so accordingly it came 'to pass."[9]

[9] Fox, viii. pp. 454, 455.

Whether it was in any degree one of those popular predictions which lead to, or only record, their own fulfilment, or whether John Rough really did dream it, and Bishop Bonner really fulfilled the dream, I know not. I will give the reader the story in Fox's words, and do not mean to waste his time or my own in any comment on it until I find ground for supposing that some respectable person believes it.

"And being before Bonner, among other talk, he affirmed that he had been twice at Rome, and there had seen plainly with his eyes, which he had many times heard of before, namely, that the pope was the very antichrist; for there he saw him carried on men's shoulders, and the false-named sacrament borne before him: yet was there more reverence given to him, than to that which they counted to be their god. When Bonner heard this, rising up, and making as though he would have torn his garments, 'Hast thou,' said he, 'been at Rome, and seen our holy father the pope, and dost thou blaspheme him after this sort?' And with that flying upon him, he plucked off a piece of his beard; and after, making speedy haste to his death, he burnt him half an hour before six of the clock in the morning, because the day, belike, should not be far spent, before he had done a mischievous deed."—*Fox*, viii. 448.

(248.) ROGER HOLLAND. There is one more history which must be given, not merely as connected with the object of this particular Essay—though even that consideration would require some notice of it—but, because it is singular and interesting in itself, and illustrates many points which have been touched on, or referred to, in the foregoing pages. We have more than once fallen in with accounts of the Secret Congregation, which kept its ground during the whole of Queen Mary's reign; and its proceedings are certainly among the most curious matters of ecclesiastical history during that period. One of its meetings is thus described by Fox;—

"Secretly, in a back close, in the field by the town of Islington, were collected and assembled together a certain company of godly and innocent persons, to the number of forty men and women, who there sitting together at prayer, and virtuously occupied in the meditation of God's holy word, first cometh a certain man to them unknown; who, looking over unto them, so stayed, and saluted them, saying, that they looked like men that meant no hurt. Then one of the said company asked the man, if he could tell whose close that was, and whether they might be so bold there to sit. 'Yea,' said he, 'for that ye seem unto me such persons as intend no harm;' and so departed.

"Within a quarter of an hour after, cometh the constable of Islington named King, warded; with six or seven others accompanying him in the same business, one with a bow, another with a bill, and others with their weapons likewise; the which six or seven persons the said constable left a little behind him in a close place, there to be ready if need should be, while he, with one with him, should go view them before; who, so doing, came through them, looking and viewing what they were doing, and what books they had; and so, going a little forward, and returning back again, bade them deliver their books. They, understanding that he was constable, refused not so to do. With that cometh forth the residue of his fellows above touched, who bade them stand and not depart. They answered again, they would be obedient and ready to go whithersoever they would have them; and so were they first carried to a brewhouse but a little way off, while that some of the said soldiers ran to the justice next at hand: but the justice was not at home; whereupon they were had to sir Roger Cholmley.

"In the mean time some of the women, being of the same number of the aforesaid forty persons, escaped away from them, some in the close, some before they came to the brewhouse. For so they were carried, ten with one man, eight with another; and with some more, with some less, in such sort as it was not hard for them to escape that would. In fine, they that were carried to sir Roger Cholmley, were twenty-seven; which sir Roger Cholmley and the recorder taking their names in a bill, and calling them one by one, so many as answered to their names he sent to Newgate. In the which number of them that answered, and that were sent to Newgate, were twenty and two."—*Fox*, viii. 468.

Among these twenty and two, who did not take advantage of the facilities afforded for escape, one was the subject of our narrative;—

"This Roger Holland, a merchant-tailor of London, was first an apprentice with one master Kempton, at the Black-Boy in Watling-street, where he served his apprenticeship with much trouble unto his master in breaking him from his licentious liberty, which he had before been trained and brought up in, giving himself to riot, as dancing, fencing, gaming, banqueting, and wanton company; and besides all this, being a stubborn and an obstinate papist, far unlike to come to any such end as God called him unto; the which was as followeth:—

"His master, notwithstanding this his lewdness, putting him in trust with his accounts, he had received for him certain money, to the sum of thirty pounds; and falling into ill company, lost the said money every groat at dice, being past all hope which way to answer it; and therefore he purposed to convey himself away beyond the seas, either into France or into Flanders.

"Now having determined with himself thus to do, he called betimes in the morning to a servant in the house, an ancient and discreet maid, whose name was Elizabeth, which professed the gospel, with a life agreeing unto the same, and at all times much

rebuking the wilful and obstinate papistry, as also the licentious living of this Roger Holland: to whom he said, 'Elizabeth, I would I had followed thy gentle persuasions and friendly rebukes; which if I had done, I had never come to this shame and misery which I am now fallen into; for this night have I lost thirty pounds of my master's money, which to pay him, and to make up mine accounts, I am not able. But thus much I pray you, desire my mistress, that she would entreat my master to take this bill of my hand, that I am thus much indebted unto him; and if I be ever able, I will see him paid: desiring him that the matter may pass with silence, and that none of my kindred nor friends may ever understand this my lewd part; for if it should come unto my father's ears, it would bring his grey hairs oversoon unto his grave.' And so was he departing.

"The maid considering that it might be his utter undoing, 'Stay,' said she; and having a piece of money lying by her, given unto her by the death of a kinsman of hers (who, as it was thought, was Dr. Redman), she brought unto him thirty pounds, saying, 'Roger, here is thus much money; I will let thee have it, and I will keep this bill. But since I do thus much for thee, to help thee, and to save thy honesty, thou shalt promise me to refuse all lewd and wild company, all swearing and ribaldry talk; and if ever I know thee to play one twelve pence at either dice or cards, then will I show this thy bill unto my master. And furthermore, thou shalt promise me to resort every day to the lecture at All-hallows, and the sermon at Paul's every Sunday, and to cast away all thy books of papistry and vain ballads, and get thee the Testament and Book of Service, and read the Scriptures with reverence and fear, calling unto God still, for his grace to direct thee in his truth. And pray unto God fervently, desiring him to pardon thy former offences, and not to remember the sins of thy youth; and ever be afraid to break his laws, or offend his Majesty. Then shall God keep thee, and send thee thy heart's desire.'

"After this time within one half-year God had wrought such a change in this man, that he was become an earnest professor of the truth, and detested all papistry and evil company; so that he was in admiration to all them that had known him, and seen his former life and wickedness.

"Then he repaired into Lancashire unto his father, and brought divers good books with him, and bestowed them upon his friends, so that his father and others began to taste of the gospel, and to detest the mass, idolatry, and superstition; and in the end his father gave him a stock of money to begin the world withal, to the sum of fifty pounds.

"Then he repaired to London again, and came to the maid that lent him the money to pay his master withal, and said unto her, 'Elizabeth, here is thy money I borrowed of thee; and for the friendship, good will, and the good counsel I have received at thy hands, to recompense thee I am not able, otherwise than to make thee my wife.' And soon after they were married, which was in the first year of queen Mary. And having a child by her, *he caused master Rose to baptize his said child* in his own house. Notwithstanding he was bewrayed unto the enemies, and he being gone into

the country to convey the child away, that the papists should not have it in their anointing hands, Bonner caused his goods to be seized upon, and most cruelly used his wife.

"After this he remained closely in the city, and in the country in the congregations of the faithful, until the last year of queen Mary. Then he, with the six others aforesaid, were taken in, or not far from, St. John's Wood, and so brought to Newgate upon May-day, in the morning, anno 1558."—*Fox*, viii. 473.

As nothing tends more to make a story intelligible, and give a true weight to its facts, than a proper understanding, and present recollection of its chronology, I must beg the reader to observe that Roger Holland was not a person accidentally present, or even a new convert. It seems as if he must have made profession of the reformed opinions for at least five years, and probably longer; and that his wife had done so, admits of little doubt. "Being called before the Bishop," says Fox, "Dr. Chedsey, both the Harpsfields, 'and certain others, after many other fair and crafty per-'suasions of Dr. Chedsey, to allure him to their Babylonical 'church, thus the Bishop began with him;—

"Holland, I for my part do wish well unto thee, and the more for thy friends' sake. And, as Dr. Standish telleth me, you and he were both born in one parish, and he knoweth your father to be a very honest catholic gentleman. And master doctor told me, that he talked with you a year ago; and found you very wilfully addict to your own conceit. Divers of the city also have showed me of you, that you have been a great procurer of men's servants to be of your religion, and to come to your congregations. But since you be now in danger of the law, I would wish you to play a wise man's part; so shall you not want any favour I can do or procure for you, both for your own sake, and also for your friends', which be men of worship and credit, and wish you well: and by my troth, Roger, so do I.'

"Then said master Eglestone, a gentleman of Lancashire, and near kinsman to Roger, being there present, 'I thank your good lordship; your honour meaneth good unto my cousin; I beseech God he have the grace to follow your counsel.'

"*Holland.* 'Sir, you crave of God you know not what. I beseech God to open your eyes to see the light of his word.'

"*Eglestone.* 'Roger, hold your peace, lest you fare the worse at my lord's hands.'

"*Holland.* 'No, I shall fare as it pleaseth God; for man can do no more than God doth permit him.'

"Then the bishop and the doctors, with Johnson the registrar, casting their heads together, in the end saith Johnson, 'Roger, how sayest thou? wilt thou submit thyself unto my lord, before thou be entered into the book of contempt?'

"*Holland.* 'I never meant but to submit myself unto the magis-

trate, as I learn of St. Paul to the Romans, chap. xiii.:' and so he recited the text.

"*Chedsey.* 'Then I see you are no Anabaptist.'

"*Holland.* 'I mean not yet to be a papist; for they and the Anabaptists agree in this point not to submit themselves to any other prince or magistrate, than those that must first be sworn to maintain them and their doings.'

"*Chedsey.* 'Roger, remember what I have said, and also what my lord hath promised he will perform with further friendship. Take heed, Roger, for your ripeness of wit hath brought you into these errors.'

"*Holland.* 'Master doctor, I have yet your words in memory, though they are of no such force as to prevail with me.'

"Then they whispered together again, and at the last said Bonner, 'Roger, I perceive thou wilt be ruled by no good counsel, for any thing that either I, or your friends, or any others can say.'

"*Holland.* 'I may say to you, my lord, as Paul said to Felix and unto the Jews, as doth appear in Acts xxii, and in 1 Cor. xv.'"—*Ibid.* 474.

After a good deal of discussion, Roger Holland seems to have become somewhat excited. He exclaimed, "As for the 'unity which is in your church, what is it else but treason, 'murder, poisoning one another, idolatry, superstition, 'wickedness? What unity was in your church, when there 'were three popes at once? Where was your head of unity, 'when you had a woman pope? Here he was interrupted, 'and could not be suffered to proceed; 'But,' saith the 'bishop, 'Roger, these thy words are very blasphemy, and 'by the means of thy friends thou hast been suffered to 'speak, and art over malapert to teach any here. There-'fore, Keeper, take him away.'"

So the matter rested until his second examination; the account of which begins thus;—

"The day that Henry Pond and the rest were brought forth to be again examined, Dr. Chedsey said, 'Roger, I trust you have now better considered of the Church than you did before.'

"*Holland.* 'I consider thus much: that out of the church there is no salvation, as divers ancient doctors say.'

"*Bonner.* 'That is well said. Master Egleston, I trust your kinsman will be a good catholic man. But Roger, you mean, I trust, the church of Rome?'

"*Holland.* 'I mean that Church which hath Christ for her head; which also hath his word, and his sacraments according to his word and institution.'

"Then Chedsey interrupted him, and said, 'Is that a Testament you have in your hand?'

"*Holland.* 'Yea, master doctor, it is the New Testament. You

will find no fault with the translation, I think. It is of your own translation, it is according to the great Bible.'

"*Bonner.* 'How say you? How do you know it is the Testament of Christ, but only by the church? for the church of Rome hath and doth preserve it, and out of the same hath made decrees, ordinances, and true expositions.'

"'No,' saith Roger, 'the church of Rome hath and doth suppress the reading of the Testament. And what a true exposition (I pray you) did the pope make thereof, when he set his foot on the emperor's neck, and said, "Thou shalt walk upon the lion and the asp: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou tread under thy foot?'

"Then said the bishop, 'Such unlearned wild heads as thou and others would be expositors of the Scripture. Would you then the ancient learned (as there be some here, as well as I) should be taught of you?'

"*Holland.* 'Youth delighteth in vanity. My wildness hath been somewhat the more by your doctrine, than ever I learned out of this book of God. But, my lord, I suppose some of the old doctors say, If a poor layman bring his reason and argument out of the word of God, he is to be credited afore the learned, though they be never so great doctors: for the gift of knowledge was taken from the learned doctors, and given to poor fishermen. Notwithstanding I am ready to be instructed by the church.'

"*Bonner.* 'That is very well said, Roger: but you must understand that the church of Rome is the catholic church. Roger, for thy friends' sake (I promise thee) I wish thee well, and I mean to do thee good.—Keeper! see he want nothing. Roger, if thou lack any money to pleasure thee, I will see thou shalt not want.'

"This he spake unto him alone, his fellows being apart, with many other fair promises; and so he was sent to prison again." —*Ibid.* p. 476.

The sequel of the story is as follows;—

["The last examination of Roger Holland was, when he with his fellow prisoners were brought into the Consistory, and there excommunicated all, saving Roger, and ready to have their sentence of judgment given, with many threatening words to fear them withal: the lord Strange, sir Thomas Jarret, master Egleston esquire, and divers other of worship, both of Cheshire and Lancashire, that were Roger Holland's kinsmen and friends, being there present, which had been earnest suitors to the bishop in his favour, hoping for his safety of life. Now the bishop, hoping yet to win him with his fair and flattering words, began after this manner:]

"*Bonner.* 'Roger, I have divers times called thee before home to my house, and have conferred with thee; and being not learned in the Latin tongue, it doth appear unto me thou art of a good memory, and of a very sensible talk, but something over hasty, which is a natural disease to some men. And surely they are not the worst natured men: for I myself shall now and then be hasty, but mine anger is soon past. So, Roger, surely I have a good opinion of you, that you will not with these lewd fellows cast

yourself headlong from the church of your parents and your friends that are here (very good catholics, as it is reported unto me). And as I mean thee good, so, Roger, play the wise man's part, and come home with the lost son, and say, I have run into the church of schismatics and heretics, from the catholic church of Rome; and you shall, I warrant you, not only find favour at God's hands, but the church, that hath authority, shall absolve you, and put new garments upon you, and kill the fatling to make thee good cheer withal; that is, in so doing, as meat doth refresh and cherish the mind, so shalt thou find as much quietness of conscience in coming home to the church, as did the hungry son that had been fed afore with the hogs, as you have done with these heretics that sever themselves from the church. I give them a homely name, but they be worse,' putting his hand to his cap for reverence sake, 'than hogs: for they know the church, and will not follow it. If I should say thus much to a Turk, he would (I think) believe me. But, Roger, if I did not bear thee and thy friends good will, I would not have said so much as I have done, but I would have let mine ordinary alone with you.'

"At these words his friends that were there gave the bishop thanks for his good will and pains that he had taken in his and their behalf.

"*Bonner.* 'Well, Roger, how say you? Do you not believe that after the priest hath spoken the words of consecration, there remaineth the body of Christ really and corporally under the forms of bread and wine? I mean the self-same body that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified upon the cross, and rose again the third day.'

"*Holland.* 'Your lordship saith, the same body which was born of the Virgin Mary, which was crucified upon the cross, which rose again the third day: but you leave out, which ascended into heaven; and the Scripture saith, he shall there remain until he come to judge the quick and the dead! Then he is not contained under the forms of bread and wine, by 'Hoc est corpus meum,' &c.

"*Bonner.* 'Roger, I perceive my pains and good will will not prevail, and if I should argue with thee, thou art so wilful (as all thy fellows be, standing in thine own singularity and foolish conceit) that thou wouldst still talk to no purpose this seven years, if thou mightest be suffered. Answer whether thou wilt confess the real and corporal presence of Christ's body in the sacrament or wilt not.'

"*Holland.* 'My lord, although God by his sufferance hath here placed you, to set forth his truth and glory in us his faithful servants; notwithstanding, your meaning is far from the zeal of Christ: and for all your words, you have the same zeal that Annas and Caiaphas had, trusting to their authority, traditions and ceremonies, more than to the word of God.'

"*Bonner.* 'If I should suffer him, he would fall from reasoning to railing, as a frantic heretic.'

"'Roger!' saith the Lord Strange, 'I perceive my lord would have you tell him whether you will submit yourself to him or no.'

"'Yea,' saith Bonner, 'and confess this presence that I have spoken of.'

"With this, Roger, turning him to the Lord Strange and the rest of his kinsmen and friends, very cheerfully kneeled down upon his knees, and said, 'God, by the mouth of his servant St. Paul, hath said, 'Let every soul submit himself unto the higher powers, and he that resisteth receiveth his own damnation:' and as you are a magistrate appointed by the will of God, so do I submit myself unto you, and to all such as are appointed for magistrates.'

"*Bonner.* 'That is well said; I see you are no Anabaptist. How say you then to the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar?'"—*Ibid.* p. 477.

This led, as usual, to the plain demonstration that all attempts at agreement and reconciliation were fruitless. At length Holland said:—

"As for the mass, transubstantiation, and the worshipping of the sacrament, they are mere impiety and horrible idolatry.

"'I thought so much,' said Bonner, suffering him to speak no more, 'how he would prove a very blasphemous heretic as ever I heard. How unreverently doth he speak of the blessed mass!' And so read his bloody sentence of condemnation, adjudging him to be burnt.

"All this while Roger was very patient and quiet; and when he should depart, he said, 'My lord, I beseech you suffer me to speak two words.' The bishop would not hear him, but bade him away. Notwithstanding, being requested by one of his friends, he said, 'Speak, what hast thou to say?'

"*Holland.* 'Even now I told you that your authority was from God, and by his sufferance. And now I tell you, God hath heard the prayer of his servants, which hath been poured forth with tears for his afflicted saints, which daily you persecute, as now you do us. But this I dare be bold in God to speak (which by his Spirit I am moved to say), that God will shorten your hand of cruelty, that for a time you shall not molest his church. And this shall you in short time well perceive, my dear brethren, to be most true; for after this day, in this place, shall there not be any by him put to the trial of fire and faggot.'

"And after this day there was none that suffered in Smithfield for the testimony of the gospel, God be thanked.

"After these words spoken, said Bonner, 'Roger, thou art, I perceive, as mad in these thy heresies as ever was Joan Boucher. In anger and fume thou wouldst become a railing prophet. Though thou and all the sort of you would see me hanged, yet I shall live to burn, yea I will burn all the sort of you that come in my hands, that will not worship the blessed sacrament of the altar, for all thy prattling.' And so he went his way."—*Fox*, viii. 478.

Although none suffered after that time in Smithfield, the persecution continued; but I do not know that it is needful to notice, at present, the cases of any of the martyrs with

whom Bonner subsequently had to do. I therefore pass them over, not merely, as I have done others, to avoid prolixity; but under the impression that I have perhaps already extracted more than enough from those cases which seem to throw most light on the personal character and conduct of Bishop Bonner; and particularly as it regards the charge of cruelty. I am not writing to set him up as a model of wisdom, piety, and virtue; but to examine a charge of blood-thirstiness, which, if it be not true, has been so made as not only to be a very unjust slander against an individual, but a gross falsification of history, which every man who loves truth better than party must wish to see corrected. I have endeavoured to select the cases fairly; but I may probably have passed over, without observing, or not understanding, them, matters which ought to have been brought before the notice of the reader; and which would go to contradict, or qualify, statements of fact or opinion which I have made. Such faults, if they exist, will I think be more easily discovered by the reader, now that I have taken the trouble of picking up, and putting together, some points of history which may be clearly made out; though they do not at first shew themselves in the loose, rambling, narrative of Fox. Indeed when it is considered how his work was at first "hastily rashed up," how it has since been printed, reprinted, and at length even edited, with omissions, insertions, dislocations, and almost everything that could make it puzzling, I shall not wonder to find that I have fallen into some mistakes in making so much use of such an authority. I shall, however, be very happy to discuss any case which I may be thought to have misrepresented or improperly passed over.

To assist any reader, who is so disposed, in verifying or correcting my statements—as well as the more general reader of our ecclesiastical history, in understanding the Times of Queen Mary, and particularly the very singular historian to whom we are most indebted for what we know of them—I here subjoin a List of the Martyrs who suffered in England under the Marian persecution, in which those with whom I believe Bishop Bonner to have had any concern, are distinguished by *italics*. I am afraid to vouch for its perfect accuracy, though a good deal of trouble (more perhaps than some readers might suppose requisite for such a

matter) has been taken to make it as full and correct as possible; and, finding the number as I took them from Fox, to coincide with that which had been long since given, on I know not what original authority, I am induced to hope that my List is not far wrong. The object being, as I have already stated, to assist readers of Fox—that is, Fox himself, not Fox as cooked and served up by Strype or Burnet, Fuller or Collier, or more modern writers—the names of the martyrs are given in the order in which the martyrologist has related their histories[1]. This course, while it avoids any difficulty which might arise in settling the precise date in any case, very seldom and very slightly violates the order of chronology. For, though it may not be apparent to some readers who dip into Fox, yet those who study his work will see that he not only professed to follow the order of time, but (notwithstanding innumerable wanderings about, and surprising leaps backwards and forwards) he actually did it to a much greater extent than is at first apparent.

A LIST OF THE MARTYRS

WHO SUFFERED IN ENGLAND DURING THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

1. *John Rogers*	Smithfield	4	Feb.	1555.	Vol. vi. p.	591
2. *Laurence Saunders*	Coventry	8	,,	,,	,,	612
3. *John Hooper*	Gloucester	9	,,	,,	,,	636
4. *Rowland Taylor*	Hadley	,,	,,	,,	,,	676
5. *Thomas Tomkins*	Smithfield	17	Mar.	,,	,,	717
6. *William Hunter*	Brentwood	26	,,	,,		722
7. *Thomas Causton*	Raleigh	,,	,,	,,	,,	729
8. *Thomas Higbed*	Horndon-on-the-hill	,,	,,	,,	,,	
9. *William Pygot*	Braintree	28	,,	,,	,,	737
10. *Stephen Knight*	Maldon	,,	,,	,,	,,	
11. *John Laurence*	Colchester	29	,,	,,	,,	

[1] For the reason mentioned at p. 362, the references are made to the octavo edition of Messrs. Seeley.

12. Bp. Ferrar	Carmarthen	30 Mar.	1555.	Vol. vii. p.	3
13. Rawlins White	Cardiff	about 30 Mar.	"	"	8
14. George Marsh	Chester	24 April	"	"	39
15. *William Flower*	Westminster	" "	"	"	68
16. *John Cardmaker*	Smithfield	30 May	"	"	77
17. *John Warne*	do.	" "	"	"	
18. *John Simson*	Rochford	about 10 June	"	"	87
19. *John Ardeley*	Raleigh	about	"	"	87
20. *Thomas Haukes*	Coggeshall	10 June	"	"	97
21. *Thomas Wats*	Chelmsford	22 May or 9 June	"	"	118
22. *Thomas Osmond*	Manningtree	15 June	"	"	139
23. *William Bomford alias Butler*	Harwich	" "	"	"	
24. *Nicolas Chamberlain*	Colchester	14 June	"	"	
25. *John Bradford*	Smithfield	July	"	"	143
26. *John Leaf*					192
27. John Bland	Canterbury	12 July	"	"	287
28. Nicolas Sheterden					306
29. John Frankish					*ib.*
30. Humphrey Middleton					*ib.*
31. Nicolas Hall	Rochester	19 "	"	"	318
32. Christopher Wade	Dartford	" "	"	"	
33. *Dirick Carver*	Lewes	22 "	"	"	321
34. *John Launder*	Stenning	23 "	"	"	
35. *Thomas Iveson*	Chichester		"	"	327
36. James Abbes	Bury	2 Aug.	"	"	328
37. *John Denley*	Uxbridge	8 "	"	"	
38. *John Newman*	Saffron Walden	31 "	"	"	
39. *Patrick Packingham*	Uxbridge	28 "	"	"	
40. Richard Hook.	Chichester		"	"	339
41. William Coker	Canterbury	about end of Aug.	"	"	339
42. William Hopper					
43. Henry Lawrance					
44. Richard Collier					
45. Richard Wright					
46. William Stere					
47. *Elizabeth Warne*	Stratford-le-Bow	July	"	"	341
48. *George Tankerfield*	St. Albans	26 Aug.	"	"	
49. *Robert Smith*	Uxbridge	8 "	"	"	
50. *Stephen Harwood*	Stratford-le-Bow		"	"	
51. *Thomas Fust*	Ware		"	"	
52. *William Hale*	Barnet	end of Aug.	"	"	
53. *Joan Lashford*	London	27 Jan.	1556	"	
54. Robert Samuel	[Ipswich]	31 Aug.	1555	"	371
55. William Allen	Walsingham		"	"	381

56. Roger Coo	Yoxford	Sept. 1555.	Vol. vii. p.	381
57. Thomas Cobb	Thetford	„ „	„	382
58. George Catmer 59. Robert Streater 60. Anthony Burward 61. George Brodbridge 62. Jane Tutty	Canterbury	about 6 Sept. „	„	383
63. Thomas Hayward 64. John Goreway	Lichfield	about mid. Sept. „	„	383
65. Robert Glover	Coventry	about 20 Sept. „	„	384
66. Cornelius Bungay			„	399
67. William Wolsey	Ely	16 Oct. „	„	402
68. Robert Pygot 69. Nicholas Ridley 70. Hugh Latimer	Oxford	„ „ „	„	406
71. William Dighel	Banbury	about 16 Oct. „	„	583
72. John Webbe 73. George Roper 74. Gregory Parke	Canterbury	end of Oct. or beginning of Nov. „	„	604
75. *John Philpot*	Smithfield	18 Dec. „	„	605
76. *Thomas Whittle* 77. *Bartlet Green* 78. *John Tudson* 79. *John Went* 80. *Thomas Brown* 81. *Isabel Forster*	London	27 Jan. 1556	„	715
82. John Lomas 83. Agnes Snoth 84. Anne Albright 85. Joan Sole 86. Joan Catmer	Canterbury	31 „ „	„	750
87. *Archbishop Cranmer*	Oxford	21 Mar. „	viii. p.	3
88. Agnes Potten 89. Joan Frenchfield	Ipswich	end of Feb. or Mar. „	„	101
90. John Maundrel 91. William Coberley 92. John Spicer	Salisbury	14 Mar. „	„	102
93. *Robert Drakes* 94. *William Tyms* 95. *Richard Spurge* 96. *Thomas Spurge* 97. *John Cavel* 98. *George Ambrose*	Smithfield	23 April „	„	105
99. John Harpole 100. Joan Beach	Rochester	1 „ „	„	130
101. John Hullier	Cambridge	about 2 April „	„	131
102. *Christopher Lyster*	Colchester	28 „ „	„	138

103. *John Mace*	Colchester	28 April,	1556.	Vol. viii. p.	138
104. *John Spencer*					
105. *Simon Joyne*					
106. *Richard Nichols*					
107. *John Hamond*					
108. *Hugh Laverock*	Stratford-le-Bow	15 May	„	„	140
109. *John Apprice*					
110. *Catherine Hutt*	Smithfield	16 „	„	„	141
111. *Elizabeth Thackwel*					
112. *Joan Horns*					
113. Thomas Drowry	Gloucester	5 „	„	„	144
114. Thomas Crocker					
115. Thomas Spicer	Beccles	21 „	„	„	145
116. John Denny					
117. Edmund Poole					
118. *Thomas Harland*	Lewes	about 6 June	„	„	151
119. *John Oswald*					
120. *Thomas Avington*					
121. *Thomas Read*					
122. Thomas Whodd	Lewes	20 „	„	„	
123. Thomas Milles					
124. A Merchant's Servant	Leicester	26 „	„	„	
125. *Henry Adlington*	Stratford-le-Bow	27 „	„	„	151
126. *Lawrance Pernam*					
127. *Henry Wye*					
128. *William Hallywell*					
129. *Thomas Bowyer*					
130. *George Searles*					
131. *Edmund Hurst*					
132. *Lyon Cawch*					
133. *Ralph Jackson*					
134. *John Derifall*					
135. *John Routh*					
136. *Elizabeth Pepper*					
137. *Agnes George*					
138. Roger Bernard	Bury		„	„	157
139. Adam Forster					
140. Robert Lawson					
141 Julius Palmer	Newbury	16 July	„	„	201
142. John Gwin					
143. Thomas Askin					
144. Thomas Dangate	Grinstead	18 „	„	„	241
145 John Foreman					
146. Mother Tree					
147. Thomas Moor	Leicester	about 26 June	„	„	242
148. Joan Waste	Derby	1 Aug.	„	„	247
149. Edward Sharp	Bristol	about beginning of Sept.	„	„	250
150. Anonymous	Mayfield	24 Sept.	„	„	

151. Anonymous.	Mayfield	24 Sept.	1556.	Vol. viii. p. 250	
152. John Hart					
153. Thomas Ravensdale					
154. A Young Man	Bristol	26 „	„	„	251
155. John Horn	Wotton-under-edge	27 „	„	„	
156. A Woman					
157. A Shoemaker	Northampton	Oct.	„	„	253
158. One called Hooke				„	
159. John Philpot	Wye	about Jan.	1557	„	300
160. William Waterer	Canterbury	15 Jan.	„	„	
161. Stephen Kempe					
162. William Hay					
163. Thomas Hudson					
164. Matthew Bradbridge	Ashford	16 „	„	„	
165. Thomas Stevens	Wye	about 16 Jan.	„	„	
166. Nicholas Final	Ashford	„ „	„	„	
167. William Lowick	Canterbury	„ „	„	„	
168. William Prowting					
169. *Thomas Loseby*	Smithfield	12 April	„	„	310
170. *Henry Ramsey*					
171. *Thomas Thirtell*					
172. *Margaret Hide*					
173. *Agnes Stanley*					
174. Stephen Gratwick	St. Geo.'s Fields, Southwark	about end of May	„	„	315
175. William Morant					
176. One King					
177. Joan Bradbridge	Maidstone	18 June	„	„	320
178. Walter Appleby					
179. Petronil his Wife					
180. Edmund Allin					
181. Catherine his Wife					
182. John Manning's Wife					
183. Elizabeth, a blind maiden					
184. John Fishcock	Canterbury	19 June	„	„	325
185. Nicolas White					
186. Nicolas Pardue					
187. Barbara Final					
188. Bradbridge's Widow					
189. Wilson's Wife					
190. Bender's Wife					
191. Richard Woodman	Lewes	22 June	„	„	332
192. George Stevens					
193. William Mainard					
194. Alexander Hosman					
195. Thomasin à Wood					
196. Margery Moris					
197. James Moris					
198. Denis Burgis					
199. Ashden's Wife					

200. Grove's Wife	Lewes	22 June, 1557.	Vol. viii.		
201. Simon Miller 202. Elizabeth Cooper	Norwich	13 July „	„		
203. *William Mount* 204. *his Wife* 205. *Rose Allin* 206. *John Johnson alias Aliker* 207. *William Bongeor* 208. *Thomas Benold* 209. *William Purcas* 210. *Agnes Silverside alias Smith* 211. *Helen Evring* 212. *Elizabeth Folkes*	Colchester	2 Aug. „	„		
213. Richard Crashfield	Norwich	5 Aug. „	„	398	
214. One Frier 215. A godly Woman	Rochester	about 5 Aug. „	„	401	
216. Mrs. Joyce Lewis	Lichfield	„	„		
217. *Ralph Allerton* 218. *James Austoo* 219. *Margery Austoo* 220. *Richard Roth*	Islington	about 17 Sept. „	„	405	
221. *Agnes Bongeor* 222. *Margaret Thurston*	Colchester	„ „ „	„	420	
223. John Kurde	Northampton	20 „ „	„	423	
224. John Noyes	Laxfield	21 „ „	„	424	
225. Cicely Ormes	Norwich	23 „ „	„	427	
226. Thomas Spurdance	Bury	Nov. „	„	430	
227. *John Hallingdale* 228. *William Sparrow* 229. *Richard Gibson* 230. *John Rough* 231. *Margaret Mering* 232. *Cutbert Symson* 233. *Hugh Foxe* 234. *John Devenish*	Smithfield	18 Nov. „ 22 Dec. „ 28 Mar. 1558 „	„ „ „	433 443 454 461	
235. William Nichol	Haverford West	9 April „	„		
236. William Seaman 237. Thomas Carman	Norwich	9 May „	„	462	
238. Thomas Hudson	Norwich	9 „ „	„		
239. William Harris 240. Richard Day 241. Christian George	Colchester	26 „ „	„	467	
242. *Henry Pond* 243. *Reinald Eastland* 244. *Robert Southam* 245. *Matthew Ricarby* 246. *John Floyd* 247. *John Holiday* 248. *Roger Holland*	Smithfield	about 27 June „	„	469	

249. *Robert Mills*	Brentford	14 July, 1558. Vol. viii. p. 479		
250. *Stephen Cotton*				
251. *Robert Dynes*				
252. *Stephen Wright*				
253. *John Slade*				
254. *William Pikas or Pikes*				
255. Richard Yeoman	Norwich	10 „ „	„	486
256. Thomas Benbridge		29 „ „	„	490
257. John Cooke	Bury	beginning of Aug.	„	492
258. Robert Miles alias Plummer				
259. Alexander Lane				
260. James Ashley				
261. Alexander Gouch	Ipswich	4 Nov.	„	493
262. Alice Driver				
263. Philip Humfrey	Bury	4 „ „	„	497
264. John David				
265. Henry David				
266. Prest's Wife	Exeter	„	„	
267. Richard Sharp	Bristol	7 May 1557	„	503
268. Thomas Benion		27 Aug. „	„	
269. Thomas Hale		7 May „	„	
270. John Corneford	Canterbury	10 Nov. 1558	„	504
271. Christopher Brown				
272. John Herst				
273. Alice Snoth				
274. Katherine Knight				
275. William Sarton	Bristol	18 Sept. 1556	„	737
276. John Snel	Bedale, Yorkshire	latter days of Q. Mary	„	739
277. Richard Snel				

INDEX.

Act of Six Articles, 196. 379; mitigated, 227.
Adams, 203.
Aduct, Thomas, 213.
Æpinus, Joannes, 295.
Alablaster, Edmund, 417.
Allen, 210; Francis, 346.
Allerton, Ralph, 430.
Ambsworth, 213.
Andrew, Philip, 409.
Andrews, St., Archbishop of, 436.
"Antichrist," the book so intituled, 16; extract from, 18.
Appleton, Roger, 401.
Ardeley, John, 382. 385.
Arran, Earl of, 486.
Arthur, Thomas, 2. 3. 6, 7.
Articles, Act of Six, 196. 379; mitigated, 227.
———, The Queen's, respecting heretics, 335; Bonner's, 38.
Ascham, Roger, 59.
Ashwell, John, Prior of Newnham, 3; his letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, 4.
Askew, Ann, 203. 216. 379, 380.
———, Henry, 336.
Atwell, one father, 366.
Audley, Lord, 212. 339.
Austins, St., Canterbury, monks of, 9.
Aylmer, Bp., 154; his Harborough, 156; tutor to Lady Jane Grey, 157.
———, Brabazon, 156.

Bacon, Lord, Abp. Parker's letter to, 79.
Baget, 388.
Baker, Sir John, his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Bale, Bp., his style, 32. 37; his declaration of Bonner's Articles, 39. 54. 130; his doctrine of toleration, 52; H. Wharton's opinion of him, 41; chaplain to Bp. Ponet, 38. 57; whether in Wyatt's Rebellion, 73; of Jack Spaniard, 130; his account of Queen Katherine Parr, 249.
Barber, Anthony, 226.
Barckley, Bp. of Bath, 61.
Barlow, Bp. of Bath, 236. 337. 376.
Barnes, Dr., 9. 200, 205. 209, 213; Bp. Gardiner's account of him, 267.
———, Sheriff, 380.
Basil, Theodore, 84
Bath and Wells, Bp. of, 345. 347. 365.
Beane, John, 21.
Beaton, Cardinal, murder of, 438.
Beckwith, Sir Leonard, 217.
Becon, Thomas, 83. 113. 147. 151.
Bedford, the Earl of, 158. 239; his deposition against Bishop Gardiner, 310.
Bedike's wife, 212.
Belenian, 203.
Benet, Thomas, 215.
Bernard College, monks of, 9.
Bernard, Thomas, 201.
Berthelet, Thomas, 276.
Bertrand of Dornick, his history, 191.

Bets, of Cardinal's College, 9.
Bible, translated, 207.
Bigges, Richard, 213.
Bilney, Thomas, 2, 3, 6. 7.
Biographia Britannica, of Katherine Parr, 249.
Bird, Bp. of Chester, 336. 393.
Bishop, Martyn, 213.
Bocher, or Butcher, 396.
Bonner, Bishop, released from prison, 332; on the Commission, 345; visitation, 38. 337; articles, 38; charge to the jury under the Act of Six Articles, 210; monition to his clergy, 335; injunctions to them, 183, 184, n.; declaration to the laity, 335; his dealings with Thomas Green, 19; with Sir Thomas Smith, 351; with Anne Askew, 216; with the martyrs condemned by the Commission, 348; with his own prisoners, 360. 384; with the Court, 380; letter to him from the Council, 409; charged with cruelty, Essay XX., 315; rage and fury, 329; tergiversation, 267; illegitimacy, 45. 47. 56; attacked by Ponet, 56, 57. 111; by Traheron, 65; his preface to Bp. Gardiner's book, 301. 306; burlesque life of, 286, n.; with John Rough, 439, 440; with R. Holland, 443—448.
Bonner, Mrs., 45.
Books, the number printed in the first 36 years of the XVI. century, 300; taken to church, 214; seditious, 337.
Bourn, Secretary, 344. 421.
Bourn, Dr., preaching at Paul's Cross, 332. 348. 355. 439.
Boxal, John, 347.
Bradford, 68. 83. 85, 86. 122. 124. 332. 336. 346, 347. 354. 355, 356, 357. 383. 403. 405.
Bret, 72.
Bridges, Sir John, 217.
Brindholme, Edmund, 200.
Brisley's wife, 213.
Bristol, Bp. of, 345.
Brook, 210.
Brown, Anthony, 332. 365. 401. 436, n.
———, Edmund, 332.
———, Dr., his reprint of Bp. Gardiner's book, 279.
Bucer, M., 278.
Bullinger, 33, n.
Burnet, Bp., of the Spanish match, 119; his idea of the ludicrous, 186; of honesty, 197; on the Act of Six Articles, 197; on the martyrdom of Barnes and others, 200; of the martyrs at Salisbury, 201; of Lacels and others, 203; of Hen. VIII, 239; of Gardiner's opposition to Cranmer, 241; of the martyrs of the commission, 357; of William Hunter, 371; of Bonner's meddling out of his own diocese, 404; of Bonner's character, 336; of Bonner's injunctions, 183.
Butler, Bp., 154, n.
Buttolph, Gregory, 200.
Bynneman, Henry, printer, 297.

Calais, the Chronicle of, edited by Mr. Nichols, 203; troubles from the Act of Six Articles, 210.
Caly, Robert, printer, 234, n.
Capito, W. F., 278.
Capon, Dr., 6.
Cardine, Sir Thomas, 338.
Cardmaker, John, 337. 346. 356. 376.
Careless, John, examination of, 22, &c.
Carew, 200.
Carlisle, Bp. of, 344. 345. 347.
Carne, Sir Edward, 239. 241; his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Carver, Dirick, 404.
Castle, Mrs., 213.
Cat hanged in Chepe, 186. 336.
Cattley's edition of Fox, 22. 30. 182. 187, n. 202. 226, n. 283, n. 288. 339, n. 382. 384. 387. 404.
Causton, Thomas, 371.
Cavendish, George, 177.
Cawood, John, printer, 85.
Chamberlayn, Sir Leonard, 347.

Chandler, Richard, 347.
Charing Cross, fray at, 408.
Chedsey, Dr., 350. 363; his declaration at Paul's Cross, 383; his talk with Haukes, 394; preaches in Bp. Bonner's chapel, 396; with Holland, 443—445.
Cheyney, Sir Thomas, 384.
Chichester, Bp., 344. 346. 424. 436.
Chidley, 210.
Children, monstrous, 142.
Cholmley, Sir Roger, 210. 441.
Christopher, William, 224.
Christopherson, Bishop, 231. 426; his book on rebellion, 232. 324.
Churches profaned and robbed, 193.
Clark, of Cardinal's College, 9.
———, Baldwin, 24, n.
Clergy summoned to Lambeth, 337. 341.
Clerk, Bp. of Bath and Wells, 2.
Clerke, one, 203.
Clinch, Wm., 226.
Cluney, 420.
Cobham, Master, 334.
Cockes, John, 213.
Coggeshall, puritans at, 335.
Coke, William, 345.
Coldock, *see* Tyndale.
Cole of Magdalen College, 9.
Commission to six bishops to examine Bishops Taylor, Hooper, and Harley, 335; at Southwark, 341.
Congregation, the Secret, 338. 437, 438. 440.
Convocation, 334.
Cooke, the Registrar, 71.
———, Dr., 426.
———, Robert, 213.
———, William, 407.
Coren, Hugh, 346, 347.
Cornet, John, 227.
Coronation of the Queen, 333.
Cottisforde, Dr., 11. 12.
Council, Letter from, to Bp. Bonner, 421.
Court, Bp. Bonner's dealings with, 380.
Coverdale, Bp., 22. 185, n. 333. 336.
Coventry and Lichfield, Bp., 345.
Cowper, of Bonner, 361.
Cox, of Cardinal's College, 9.
Cranmer, Abp., 208. 333. 336. 356. 362; Bonner's unhandsome speech concerning him, 51.
Crispin, Edward, 313.
Crayford, 210.
Crome, Dr., 344, 344 n.; his preaching at Paul's Cross, 334; signs the declaration, 347.
Cromwell, Lord, 176. 179. 181, 182. 186, n. 198. 208, 209. 339, n.
Crowley, 234.

Dalaber, or Delaber, Anthony, 9. 15.
Dale, Dr., 421, 422.
Damplip, Adam, 200. 202.
Darcy, Lord, of Chiche, 430.
David's, St., of, 345. 365.
Day, John, printer, 297.
Deane, Master, 421.
Debnam, Robert, 194.
Dee, Master, 421, 422.
Delaber, *see* Dalaber.
Denley, John, 407. 412.
Dictier, Thomas, 227.
Diet of C. C. C., Oxford, 9.
Diocesan jurisdiction regarded by Bonner, 318.
Disputation at Oxford, 336.
Dixon, of Birchin Lane, 20.
Dobbes, Richard, 345, 346.
Dodd, a Scotchman, 203.
Dormer, Michael, 210.
Doell, Sir Henry, 336.
Dover Court, the Rood at, 194. 338, n.
Draycott, Philip, 345.
Driander, Francis, his letter of Bp. Gardiner, 313.
Drum, of Cardinal's College, 9.
Drury, Sir Robert, 347.
Dudley, Lord Robert, 158.
Dunstan, Anthony, 13.
Durham, Bp. of, 344. 345. 347.

E. (K.) Letters to, 22.
E. (T.) Tragical Blast of the Papistical Trompet, 87. 122.

Eagles, George, 435, 436, n.
Ebor, Nicholas, 439.
Edmonds, Dr., 6.
Education, 232. 235.
Edward VI., Proclamation against Contempt of the Sacrament, 193.
Eeden, of Magdalen Col., Oxford, 9.
Eglestone, Master, 443. 445, 446.
Elizabeth, the Lady, committed to the Tower, 336.
———, servant to Kempton, 442, 443.
Ely, Bp. of, 344, 345. 347. 421.
Englefield, Francis, 345.
Erasmus, 12.
Estelin, Richard, 24.
Everson, Thomas, or Iveson, 405.
Examinations of the Martyrs, how far to be trusted, 268.
Exiles, English, 33; at Basil, 33; at Frankfort, 59; questions between them and the government, 69. 77. 136; Bp. Gardiner's letter to Somerset about them, 84.

Fantasie of Idolatrie, 182.
Fayrefaxe, Thomas, 15.
Fecknam, 350. 372. 392; his talk with Haukes, 394.
Ferrar, Bp. of St. David's, 9. 331. 336. 347. 356.
Fetty, John, 316. 322.
Fiddes, life of Wolsey, 181.
Filiutius on intention, 15.
Filmer, 201. 240.
Fisher, Bp. of Rochester, 2.
Fitzgerald, one, 200.
Flower, Wm., *alias* Branch, history of, 192. 375.
Foster, Sir Humphrey, 240.
———, one, 336.
Fowler, John, printer of Antwerp, 109.
Fox, Bp., *De vera Differentia*, 276.
Fox, John, his martyrology, 2. 10. 17. 22; his spirit of mockery, 187; on the Six Articles, 209.
"Foxii MSS.," 86. 119.
Frankfort, troubles of, 79, n. 82.
Frarin, Peter, his oration against the Protestants, 109.
Frith, John, 9. 59. 217.
Fuller, his account of Bp. Bonner's cruelty, 316.

Gage, Sir Edw., 405. 427.
———, Sir John, 425.
Galias, Master, 214.
Gardiner, Bp., 3; Ponet's description of, 56; his house plundered, 74; as to the Six Articles, 205; his letter to the Protector, 228. 244; and the King, Essay XV.; was he out of favour, 238; ambassador, 243; and Q. Katherine, 243; and Paget, 323; letter to the King, 255; to Paget, 257. 259; the King's answer to him, 257; with Lord Oxford's players, 259; his "Long matter," 260. 308; his answer to Paget's charges. 266; his book *De vera Obedientia*, 266. 277. 281. 283. 285. 292; charged with tergiversation, 267; his Declaration against George Joye, 267; his popery, 308; his dealings with Thos. Rose, 340; his discouragement, 356, 357.
Gardiner, Germain, 55. 240.
———, William, the history of, 189. 215.
Gardner, Robert, 194.
Garret, Thomas, 9. 200. 205. 213.
Gascoigne, Sir William, 6, 7, 8.
Gaudy, Justice, 401.
George's, St., Southwark, Session of the bishops and others there, 427.
Germaine, Giles, 203.
Germyngham, John, 345.
Giles, St., Cripplegate, parishioners of, 214.
Gloucester, Bp. of, 345.
Goldastus, his reprint of Bp. Gardiner's books, 278.
Goodman, Christopher, 78, n.; his book, 80. 87. 91. 97. 98. 132. 137. 151; extracts, 98. 106; was he in Wyatt's

rebellion, 96; his recantation, 172, n.
Grangier, Thomas, 227.
Gray, Lord, 218.
Green, Bartlet, 78, n. 79, n. 420.
Greene, Thomas, history of, 15.
Gresham, John, 210.
———, Richard, 210.
———, Master, 414.
Grey, Lady Jane, 246. 254.
Grindall, Abp., 68; of filing Philpot's examinations, 269, n.
Gualter, 10, n.
Gunnings, Derby, 200.
Gypson, 26.

Haddon, Master, 68.
Hall, Edward, 210.
Hamburgh, the story of, 288; books printed there, 290. 293.
"Harborough for faithful Subjects," 150, 156
Hardyman, John, 226.
Hare, Nicholas, 407, n.
Harold, Thomas, 410, n.
Harper, Master, 72.
———, Sir George, 334.
Harpsfield, 346, 347. 350. 363. 392. 402. 412. 419. 421. 443.
Harrison, Giles, 227.
Hart, Henry, 23. 25. 30.
Hastings, Edward, 439.
Hastlen, Wm., 215. 217. 219.
Haukes, Thomas, 234. 357. 359. 386. 396. 410, n.
Haweis's Sketches of the Reformation, 83, n.
Hayward, William, 421.
Hedio, C., 436.
Henry VIII., his protestantism, 206; his will, 238; letter to Gardiner, 257.
Henry, one, and his servant burned, 203.
Hepinus, *see* Æpinus.
Herbert, Lord, of the Act of Six Articles, 198. 206. 223; of Gardiner's book, 275.
———, Lady, 245. 247.
———, Sir Wm., deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Hertford, Earl of, *see* Somerset.
Hethe, Bp., 46.
Hewet, 201.
Heylin, of Bonner, 361. 405.
Higbed, Thomas, 371.
Higham, Clement, 346.
Hoggard Miles of Pudding Lane, 234; Strype's Account of him, *ibid.*; his ideas of education, 324; talk with Haukes, 398; of Dirick Carver, 406, n.
Holinshed, of the Act of Six Articles, 197. 223.
Holland, Roger, 440—449.
———, Seth, 347.
Hooper, Bishop, 85; letter to Bullinger, 207. 333. 336. 344, n. 345, 346, 349. 351. 356. 357.
Horn, Dean of Durham, 59.
Howards, the jealousy of them in the Somerset party, 250.
———, Lord William, 344.
Hück, Dr., or Æpinus, 295.
Huggard, *see* Hoggard.
Hume, his account of Wm. Hunter, 370.
Humfrey, John, 212.
Humphry, Laurence, 234.
Hun, Master, 414.
Hungate, Thomas, 346.
Hunter, Wm., 357. 359. 365. 366 400.
Huntingdon, Master, 218.
Hurleston, 345.
Hussey, Master, 20. 345. 347.

Jack-a-Lent, ballads of, 231.
Jarret, Sir Thomas, 446.
Jane Grey, the Lady, 332.
Idolatry, Fantasie of, 182.
Jernegam, Henry, 439.
Jerome, Wm., 200, 205. 213.
Jesabel, the name applied to Queen Mary by Knox, 105; by Goodman, 106. 108.
Illegitimacy charged against some bishops by Puritans, 45.
Inquisition, Limborch's History of, 152, n.
John, a painter, 203.
Johnson, Robert, 345. 420.
———, the Registrar, 444.

Jollif, Henry, 346.
Joye, George, 3. 6. 15.
Iveson, Thomas, 405.

Kemp, John, 23. 26.
Kempe, Andrew, 217.
Kempton, Master, 442.
Kerby, 203.
Kethe, William, 83. 88. 130. 234.
King, Robert, 194.
———, Constable of Islington, 441.
King's Bench, prisoners in, 26.
Knevetts, the Master, 334.
Knight, Stephen, 357. 359. 374. 316. 392. 400.
Knox, John, his godly letter, 67. 144; his first blast of the trumpet, 79. 99. 131; his confession, 145; repudiated by the exiles, 152; mentioned, 156. 160. 438.

Lacels, 203.
Lambert, Francis, 12.
Lamentacyon against London, 207.
Lancaster, Mayor of, his decision about a Rood, 187.
Lane, Lady, 245. 247.
Langdale, Dr., 430.
Lashford, Robert, 379.
Lathomus, Richard, 314.
Latimer, Bp., 2. 24. 213. 333. 336, 356; of the blood of Hales, 207.
Launcelot, one of the King's guard, 203.
Launder, John, 404.
Laurence, Edmund, 336.
———, John, 357. 359. 374. 392. 400.
———, Master, of Barnhall, 359, n.
Lavater, 33, n.
Laverock, Hugh, 316. 322. 327.
Leaf, John, 403.
Lent, public defamation of, 229.
Letter from the King and Queen to Bp. Bonner, 381; from the Council to Bonner respecting Rough, 439; of the Prior of Newnham to the Bp. of Lincoln, 4; letters of the martyrs, 22; to K. E., 22.
Lever, 68.
Lichfield, Bp. of, 347.
Limborch's History of the Inquisition, 152, n.
Lincoln, Bp. of, 345. 347.
Little-Ease, 433.
Lock, John, 153, n.
Lollard's Tower, 18. 20.
London, Dr., 12, 13.
———, the Archdeacon of, 210.
———, Lamentacyon against, 207. 217.
———, Troubles at, from the Act of Six Articles, 209.
Longland, Bp., 2. 7, 8. 201.
Louvain, Bp. Gardiner's disputation there, 309—315.
Lumley, the Lord, 347.
Lungport, monk of St. Austin's, Canterbury, 9.
Luther, propagation of his opinions in England, 2. 12.

Machyn, Henry, his diary, edited by Mr. Nichols, 332, n.; of the fray with the Spaniards, 408, n.
Mailer, John, grocer, 226.
Manerd, Richard, 217.
Marbeck, John, 240.
Marsh, George, 306, n.
———, Nicholas, 194.
Marshall, Mrs. Cicely, 212.
Martin, Dr., 23. 377. 379, n.
Martyn, Thomas, 345. 347.
Martyrs, letters of, 22.
Mary, St., Overy's, 340, 341. 344; Bp. White preaching there, 427.
Mary, St., Woolchurch, eight parishioners of, 213.
Mary, Queen, 254; her arrival in London, 332; her oration to the citizens of London, 116. 335; occurrences in the first year and a half of her reign, 331.
Mary's College, canons of, 9.
Mass, the two proclamations respecting, 334.
Matthew, John, 408.
Medows, Master of the Hospital of Holy Cross, Winchester, his deposition respecting Bp. Gardiner, 313.

Mekins, 201.
Mildmay, Thomas, 401.
Mildred, St., Bread Street, parishioners of, 214.
Minge, William, 383.
Mirrour (a trewe), a Dialogue, 134.
Montague, Anthony, Lord, 345. 439.
Mordant, Sir John, 323. 327. 414. 416.
———, Master George, 421.
More, Sir Thomas, his style, 37.
——, one Thomas, 420.
Morgan, 210.
———, Philip, 346, 347.
Morris, Stephen, 359, n.
Morton, James, 201.
———, a priest, 432.
Mount, William, 431.
Mountayn, Thomas, 333.
Mullins, Dr., 59.
Mungey, Mrs., Bp. Bonner's sister, 46.

Newell, Nicholas, 227.
Newman, John, 407. 412.
"News out of London," a song against the Mass, 228.
Nichols, Mr., his edition of Machyn's Diary, 332, n. 344.
Norfolk, Duke of, 345. 347; his arrest, 264. *See* Howards.
Northampton, Marquis of, his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Norwich, Bp. of, 241. 345. 347.

Oath of the Commissioners, under the Act of Six Articles, 211.
Obedientia, Oratio de Vera, 271.
Œcolampadius, 12.
Origines Literariæ, 152.
Osmond, Thomas, 403.
Owen, Dr., 246.
Oxford, disputation at, 336.
Oxford, Earl of, 387, 403; his players, 259.

Packingham, Patrick, 407.
Paget, Sir William, or Lord, 55. 238. 249. 251. 254. 344; his answers to the interrogatories respecting Bp. Gardiner, 262. 264; his early life, 254, n.; his letter to Gardiner, 259; his boasting and disgrace, 260.
Pahen, William, 217.
Palinodia, the Puritan, Essay X., 150.
Palmer, John, 213.
———, Mother, 213.
Pancras, St., the Crucifix and Pix stolen at the Church, 336.
Paris, Sir Philip, 403.
Parker, Abp., of seditious books 79.
Parkhurst, Bp., 33, n.
Parliament summoned, 337; absolved, *ibid.*; dissolved, 339.
Parnell, William, 417, n.
Parr, Katherine, 239. 243.
Parson's Three Conversions, 80.
Pascal on equivocation, 14.
Pates, Master, of David's Inn, 214
Patinson, Henry, 226.
Peerson, Anthony, 201. 240.
Pembleton, 363.
Pembroke, Earl of, 384. 421.
Peter, Sir William, 384.
Philpot, Clement, 200.
———, John, 316. 318. 334. 336 416; his conflicts with Gardiner 320; his difference with Bp Ponet, 71; examinations, 269, n
Plaine, William, 217. 225.
Plat, Robert, and his wife, 213.
Players, Printers, and Preachers alliance of, 228.
Plays and interludes, 183.
Plough, 234.
Pole, Cardinal, 200. 337.
——, David, 346, 347.
Pond, Henry, 445.
Ponet, or Poynet, chaplain to Abp. Cranmer and Henry VIII., Bp. Rochester and Winchester, 70; Strype's account of him, 71; his style, 54. 70; extracts from, 71. 75. 96, 97. 108. 111. 141; on the Spaniards, 131; Bale, his chaplain, 38.
Porter, John, story of, 220.
Pottinger, John, his deposition respecting Bp. Gardiner, 311.

Powell, William, printer, 22.
Preachers, must be no milk soppes, 166.
———, Players, and Printers, alliance of, 228.
———, the imprisoned called before the commission, 340; their declaration, 341; sent into Essex, 336.
Priests, how treated by Puritans, 233. 237.
Printers, Players, and Preachers, alliance of, 228.
Procession on the day of the Conversion of St. Paul, 341.
Proclamation by Edward VI. against contempt of the Sacrament, 193.
Proctor, 122.
———, John, history of Wyatt's rebellion, 117, n.
Protestants, allowed to quit the realm, 333.
Pulline, or Pulleyn, John, 80.
Pulpit man, Aylmer's idea of, 166
Puritan Palinodia, Essay X., 150.
——— Politics, Essay V., 66; VI., 77; VII., 98; VIII., 116; IX., 229.
——— Style, No. 1. Essay III., 32.
———, No. 2. Essay IV., 54.
——— Veracity, Essay I., 1; II., 14.
Pygot, William, 357. 359. 374. 388. 392. 400.

Radley, of Cardinal's College, Oxford, 10.
"Rage and Fury" of Bonner and other prelates, 328.
Rains, Dr., 7.
Ramsey, 201.
Rede, Richard, 407, n.
Redman, Dr., 442.
Regius, Urbanus, 299.
Repse, Bp., 203.
Retort, spirit of, among the Reformers, 266.
Ribaldry, Cromwell patron of, 182.
Ribalds, the Essay XI., 173; Essay XII., 188; distinct from polemics and enthusiasts, 189; Essay XIII., 204.
Riche, Lord, 239. 335. 401. 403. 411, n.
——, the Lord Chancellor, his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Ridley, Bp., 266. 336. 356; his courtesie, 45; his pitevovs lamentation, 22; his sermon on the Sacrament at Paul's Cross, 185; preached afterwards at Paul's Cross, 332.
Roche, 210.
Rochester, Bp. of, 427.
———, Christopher [or Robert], 345.
Roe, George, 438.
Rogers, John, 332. 334, 335. 336. 344. 345, 346. 348. 356, 357; preached at Paul's Cross, 332.
Rogers, one, 203.
Rome, the sacking of, 175.
Rood, a, newly set up in Paul's, 187.
——, of Dover Court, 194.
Roper, Master, 421.
——, William, 407, n.
Rose, Thomas, 209. 338. 438. 443.
Rough, John, 436.
Rudstone, Master, 334.

Sacrament, contempt of, 193; songs against, 227.
Sadler, Ralph, 182.
Salisbury, John, Bp. of Chartres, 41.
———, of Bury, 10.
Sanchez on mental reservation, 14, 15.
Sandys, Abp., 33, n. 81.
Saunders, Laurence, brought before Bonner and Gardiner, 270; Southey's account of the matter, 272, n.; his preaching at All-hallows, 334; excommunicated, 347; Bonner's dealings with him, 348. 356; his going to the Compter, 377.
Saxy, a priest, 203.

Say, William, 345.
Scory, Master, 438.
Scourging, for the sake of the Gospel, 423.
Secker, Abp., 153, n.
Sects, abundance of, 22.
Seeley's, Messrs., edition of Fox, 30. 182. 202, n. 255, n. 404, n. 449, n.
Sentences, Book of, 153, n.
Sergeant, Roger, 439.
Seward, John, 196.
Seymour, *see* Somerset.
Shermons, Keeper of Carpenter's Hall, 227.
Shrewsbury, Lord, 384. 439.
Shypside, George, Bp. Ridley's brother-in-law, 45, 46.
Simson, John, 382. 385.
Six Articles, *see* Act.
Smith, Dr., his talk with Haukes, 398.
———, Robt., account of, 408.
———, Sir Thomas, 351. 408.
Smyth, William, 346.
Somerset, Protector, 238; jealousy of the Howards, 250; Paget's devotion to him, 252. 254; his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 309.
Songs against the Sacrament, 227.
Southampton, Earl of, 242.
Southey's Book of the Church, 272, n.
Southwell, Sir Richard, 344. 345. 384. 411, n.
Spaniards, the, Essay VIII., 116; Bradford's letter, 86; Kethe's verses, 88; fray with, 408; Burnet on the Spanish match, 119.
Spencer, Dr., 154.
———, a priest, 201.
Squire, Dr., 156.
Stafford's rebellion, 119.
Stafford, Mr., of St. John's, Cambridge, 193.
Stage-plays and interludes, 183.
Standish, Bp., 3. 443.
State papers published under the Commission, 257.
Statham, Mrs. Elizabeth, 213.
Stempe, Dr., 372
Sternhold, Thomas, 320.
Stevens, Mr., his edition of Bp. Gardiner's book, 271.
Story, Dr., 15, 16. 379. 426.
Stowe, his account of Wyatt's rebellion, 72. 74.
Stowel, *alias* Stretchley, 122.
Strange, Lord, 446, 447.
Strype, quoted as to sects, 22; of Bp. Parkhurst, 33, n.; of Bale, 50; of Ponet, 54. 71; of Paget, 55; of the exiles at Frankfort, 59; of Kethe's verses, 88; of Stafford's rebellion, 119; life of Aylmer, 154; of railers against the Sacrament, 185; of the Six Articles, 198. 210. 223; of Bp. Christopherson's book, 231; of Bp. Gardiner, 240. 254. 275; of Germain Gardiner, 240; of Henry VIII., 252; of the Commission in Southwark, 345, n.; of Sir Thomas Smith, 351; of Bp. Bonner, 364, n. 433; his quotation of Machyn's Diary, 332, n.; his character as a historian, 17. 30, 31. 47. 122. 210.
Style of the age of the Reformation, 35.
Sumner, of Cardinal's College, Oxford, 9.
Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majesty, 85. 115. 133. 145, 146.
Sussex, letters to the Justices of, 336.
Symson, Cutbert, 439.

Taverner, of Cardinal's College, Oxford, 10.
———, Master, 12.
Taylor, Dr. Rowland, of Hadley, 336, 344. 346, 347. 352. 356, 357, 359.
———, Thomas, 366.
Tenison, Abp., his copy of Bp. Gardiner's book, 279, n.
Testwood, 201. 240.
Thirlby, Bp., his deposition respecting Bp. Gardiner, 311.
Thomas, St., of Acres, 413.

Thomas, William, 80.
Thomson, Harold, 410, n.
Tillotson, Abp., 153, n.
Tirrel, 336.
——, Sir Henry, 332. 401.
Trinity College, Cambridge, Statutes of, 214.
Tomkins, Thomas, 357. 359. 362. 400. 412.
Tomson, Harold, 344, 345, n.
Tonstal, Bp., 2, 3. 10, 11; his deposition respecting Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Tooley, John, hanged, 409.
Tottle, Master, printer, 21.
Tracy, Richard, 59.
Traheron, Bartholomew, 58, 59. 151; his answer to a privie papist, 60; warning to England 64. 144.
Tregonwell, John, 345.
Trew, one, 26.
Troubles at London, 209.
Trudgeover, 436, n.
Turner, Master, 408.
Tye, Thomas, 431.
Tymms, 23. 25. 27.
Tyndale, 3. 9.
——'s, Testament, 294.
Tyrrel, *see* Tirrel.
Tyrwit, Lady, 245.
Tysdall, Jhon, and Frauncys Coldocke, printers, 53.
Tytler, Mr. Fraser, his England under the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary, 252, 253. 259, 260.

Vane, Lady, 339, n.
Vaughan, 72; John, 346, 347.
Udal, of C. C. C., Oxford, 9.
Veron, 83.
Vervin, Monsieur, captain of Boloigne, 111.
Unio dissidentium, 9, 10.
Voysey, John, Bp. of Exeter, 2. 8.

Ward, friar, 209.
Warne, John, 378.
Warner, Dr. John, 347.
Warren, 210.
Warwick, Earl of, 254; his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Wats, Thomas, 401.
Watson the Scribe, 7.
——, Thomas, 346, 347.
Wayland, John, printer, 16.
Welch, Master, 421, 422.
Wendy, Dr., 246, 247, 248, n.
Wentworth, Sir John, 335.
West, Nicholas, Bp. of Ely, 2.
Weston, Richard, 401.
Wharton, Henry, his opinion of Bale, 41; his Protestantism, *ibid.*
——, Thomas, 345. 347. 384. 421.
White, Bp., preaching at St. Mary Overy's, 427.
——, Warden of Winchester College, deposition respecting Bp. Gardiner, 312.
Whitgift, Abp., his College accounts, 34.
Whittingham, Wm., 151; his Epistle prefixed to Goodman's book, 81. 83.
Whittle, Thomas, 417.
Wilcocks, Thomas, 24.
Willerton, 363.
Wilmot, Richard, 15.
Wiltshire, Lord, 239; his deposition against Bp. Gardiner, 310.
Wimmeslowe, Archdeacon, 57.
Winchester, Bp. of, 421. 426. 430; preached at Paul's Cross, 398.
——, Marquis of, 405.
Windsor, Commission for searching houses at, 201; the persecution at, 239, 240.
Wiseman, John, 401.
Wolphius, 33, n.
Wolsey, Cardinal, 2, 6. 7, 8; his disgrace, 176; his discourse with Cromwell, 179; called "Carnall" Wolsey, 55.
Women, Knox's 'Monstrous Regiment' of, 79. 99.
Wood, Anthony à, of Traheron 58; of Bonner's Works, 275.

Wood, Thomas, 366.
Woodman, Richard, 423.
Worcester, Bp. of, 344. 345. 347.
Wotton, R. [or Edward], 347.
Wriothesley, 55 ; Lord, 245.
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, 334, 335. 348 ; his rebellion, 72. 110. 116 ; Proctor's history of, 117.

Young, Thomas, 438.
Ysseley, Sir Harry, 334.

Zanchy, 33, n.

THE END.

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
London & Edinburgh

00031486

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 20 February, 2020